DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 369	UD 022 738

AUTHOR	Hyde, Arthur A.
TITLE	Capacities for Solving Problems: Problems and Problem Solving Methods of School Principals. Draft. Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools.
INSTITUTION	Center for New Schools, Inc., Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. School Capacity for Problem Solving Group.
PUB DATE	Aug 77
CONTRACT	400-75-0018
NOTE	146p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Human Relations; Interpersonal Relationship; *Parent Participation; Parent School Relationship; Perception; *Principals; *Problem Solving; *School Administration; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	Documentation and Technical Assistance Project

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the concept of a capacity for problem solving through an analysis of data concerning the perspectives of the local school community. The paper's underlying assumption is that within a school community, different groups (i.e., parents, teachers, or administrators) may have markedly different capacities and methods for solving the various kinds of problems of the school. The author identifies particular capacities for solving certain kinds of problems for a single subgroup--principals--in the local schools of nine sites studied by the Documentation and Technical Assistance Project (DTA), and provides descriptive analyses of the problems perceived by principals in their schools, the way these individuals conceive of problems, and the methods by which they and members of their school community address these problems. Specific areas discussed include (1) problems of securing support for the school; (2) problems of school governance; (3) problems of staff and curriculum development; (4) problems of administering the school; and (5) problems of mediating human relations in the school. A review of research on the problems of principals and their role functioning, description of the DTA study method, and major findings on capacity for problem solving are also included in the paper. (Author/AOS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228369

CAPACITIES FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS:
PROBLEMS AND PROBLEM SOLVING METHODS
OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Arthur A. Hyde

August 1977

DRAFT VERSION

FOR LIMITED CIRCULATION ONLY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD 022 738

This paper is part of the Documentation and Technical Assistance Project of the Center for New Schools, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois. This Project is funded by the School Capacity for Problem Solving Program of the National Institute of Education, contract #400-75-0018. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect views of that agency.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools Project (DTA) is an effort to learn more about how to make urban public schools work better for urban students. Toward this end, DTA combines educational research and practice within one project. DTA's mandate has three interrelated parts:

> DOCUMENTATION - to study, using primarily ethnographic techniques, the ways in which selected urban schools organize themselves to solve problems. Documentation focuses upon nine sites throughout the country selected and funded by NIE to continue to engage in locally initiated improvement activities.
>
> TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - to develop in practice specific strategies which are designed to improve urban public schooling. Technical assistance strategies are based in part upon documentation of useful practices in the nine funded sites.
>
> LINKAGE - to increase understanding, through observation of DTA's attempts to link documentation with technical assistance, of the processes through which research can be useful to practice, and practice can influence research.

Our work is designed to effect school improvement through direct work in urban public schools and through sharing what we learn with the following audiences: parents, teachers, and administrators of urban public schools; the educational research community; groups or agencies working to assist urban schools; policy makers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to gratefully acknowledge the contribution to this paper made by the staff of the DTA project. The basic data from the six projects discussed in this paper were collected and analyzed by site researchers, Robert Brown, Jacqueline Peek Davis, Chitra Karunakaran, Gerald Gordon, Lilliam Paoli, and Gladys Rivera with the assistance of special site advisors Patrick Montesano and Elaine Simon. The analysis of this paper was facilitated by the insightful suggestions of fellow research coordinators, Deborah Baldwin and Norris Johnson; of the Documentation Team director, Stephen Wilson; and of the New York Region director, Teresa C. Lenoir. The writing of the paper was enhanced by the critical review of the DTA project director, Thomas A. Wilson and the Senior Research Analyst, Hannah Meara. Final editing was done by production assistants Sarah Marter and Micky Forbes. Typing of the paper was done by Diane Roberts, Gloria Spann and Eva Diaz.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

I. Introduction....................1

- A. Previous Research on Problems and Role Functioning of Principals.....8
- B. Sources of Data and Methods of Cross-Site Analysis..........18
- C. The DTA Study: The Principals and Their Schools..........19
- D. An Analytical Framework of Problems..........24
- E. Major Findings..........32

II. Problems of Securing Support for the School..........36

- A. From Whom Did the Principals Derive Direction and Support?..........38
- B. How Did the Principals Promote Parent and Community Participation?...41
- C. How Did the Principal Deal with the School System?..........42
- D. What Kinds of Additional Resources Did Principals Import?..........43
- E. Visions Concerning Securing Support for the School..........46
- F. Crises Concerning Securing Support for the School..........53
- G. Problematic Situations Concerning Securing Support for the School....62

III. Problems of Governing the School..........66

- A. To What Extent Were Parents and Community Members Involved in Governance?..........68
- B. What Were the Structures Used by the Principals for Governing the Schools?..........70
- C. How did the Principals Deal with Parents' Level of Sophistication in Governance?..........72
- D. How did the Principals Deal with Divergent Groups in Governance?.....73
- E. Visions Concerning Governing the School..........76
- F. Problematic Situations Concerning Governing the School..........82

IV. Problems of Developing Curriculum and Staff in the School.............87

A. What Were the Rationales of the Principal in Development?.........89

B. What Were the Principals' Roles in Developing Curriculum and Staff?...90

C. Visions Concerning Developing Curriculum and Staff................93

D. Problematic Situations Concerning Developing Curriculum and Staff in the School...98

V. Problems of Administering the School...................................102

A. How Did the Principals Manage Their Schools?......................104

B. On What Basis Did Principals Make Administrative Arrangements?....109

C. Problematic Situations Concerning Administering the School........111

VI. Problems of Mediating Human Relations in the School..................120

A. How Did the Principals Deal with Student Behavior?................122

B. How Did the Principals Try to Enhance Teacher Morale?.............124

C. Visions Concerning Mediating Human Relations.......................125

D. Crises Concerning Mediating Human Relations.......................127

E. Problematic Situations Concerning Mediating Human Relations.......128

VII. Conclusion...131

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Page

A. Previous Research on Problems and Role Functioning of Principals........8

B. Sources of Data and Methods of Cross-Site Analysis......................18

C. The DTA Study: The Principals and Their Schools........................19

D. An Analytical Framework of Problems.....................................24

E. Major Findings..32

8

INTRODUCTION

The documentation aspect of the Documentation and Technical Assistance (DTA) Project, funded by the National Institute of Education, studied the efforts of nine funded projects each with its own particular strategy to building "a capacity for problem solving" within local schools. The nine projects varied in what they thought such a capacity might be and how it might be built or facilitated in local schools. Funds for the projects were given to a wide range of groups which included university educators, private educational firms, school district administrators, a state teacher's association, a community corporation and a mental health consortium. Although these groups varied greatly on a number of dimensions, for convenience they will be referred to as technical assistance groups (TAGs) as they purported to assist local schools in building a capacity for problem solving.*

In the course of two years of studying the nine projects and their strategies for building capacity for problem solving, several key concepts have been clarified. Although a final resolution of variations in meaning has not been achieved, the following working definitions are held by the different researchers and technical assisters of DTA:

> A problem is a discrepancy perceived by someone or some group between a current state of affairs and some better state.

---

* Readers desiring a detailed description of these TAGs and the ethnographic research process may consult S. Wilson (1977). Holliday (1977) and Schmuck, et al., (1977) provide descriptions of the technical assistance aspect of DTA.

> Problem solving is a set of processes by which people (in schools) work towards resolving or diminishing what is perceived to be a problem. This set is not necessarily sequential.
>
> Capacity for problem solving is the structures, procedures, and culture (including motivational structures) of a local school that supports its participants (school staff, parents, and students) in problem solving on a regular recurrent basis.
>
> Facilitating problem solving capacity is the deliberate set of actions taken by an external agent aimed at the durable increase of independent problem solving capacity at the school.

The reader will note that on the following pages these basic definitions are used. The documentation researchers have prepared reports of both primary and secondary analyses of the funded strategies as studied in one or two schools in each of the nine sites. Primary analyses are reported in case studies written by nine site researchers. Secondary analyses are reported in several cross-site analytical papers, of which this is one, written by research coordinators and directors.

In one of these papers Wilson (1977) gives an overview of the conceptual approaches to the nature of a capacity for problem solving as employed by the nine technical assistance groups. Wilson's analysis differs in perspective from the approach of this paper. He notes that, from the perspective of the technical assistance groups, one can distinguish three basic conceptual approaches to the nature of a capacity for problem solving, each rooted in its own theoretical and empirical traditions. These traditions are:

1. The study of the school's relationships to their community and political environments.
2. The study of teaching and teaching as a profession/craft.

3. The study of schools as formal organizations.

Wilson's is one of a number of possible perspectives from which to analyze the nature of a capacity for problem solving.

The general purpose of this paper is to examine the concept of capacity for problem solving through an exploratory analysis of the data concerning the perspectives of the local school people, not that of the technical assistance groups. In this paper a capacity for problem solving will be defined by two aspects 1) how a problem is perceived and conceived and 2) what methods or strategies are undertaken by the perceiver to solve the problem. For a capacity to be evidenced for solving problems of a given kind, the strategies or methods ought to resolve the problem with increasing success, ease, or rapidity over time as noted by Miles (1976). It is the assumption of this paper that within a school community different groups (e.g. parents, teachers, administrators - or subgroups of these) may have markedly different perceptions of the problems of the school and methods of solving problems. Therefore, there may be different capacities for solving the various kinds of problems of the different groups in the school community.

The basic concepts expressed here are similar to those of Becker and his colleagues (1961) in that both are concerned with viewing problematic situations in terms of people's perceptions rather than in terms of some outside designation. Both are also concerned with the relationship between perception and actions. Becker and his colleagues, in their definition of perspective, bring together the concepts of perception and action. Their definition follows:

> We use the term perspective to refer to a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some

> problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting in such a situation (p. 34).

Such a focus on individual and varying group perspectives has the following implications:

> Clearly, a situation will not present the same problem to all people. Some will have a way to act in the situation so that it calls for no thought at all; the situation is not problematic for them. Others will perceive the problem differently, depending on their prior perspectives....The situation is problematic only in terms of the perspective the individual brings to bear on it (p. 35).

There are two important differences between the concepts expressed in this paper and those of Becker and his colleagues. First, they do not see problems as discrepancies between current and ideal states as in the DTA working definition. Second they tie thought and action together, conceptually, whereas this paper separates them for analysis.

The main assumption of this paper would suggest that within a school community one could determine, for subgroups of people, patterns of common perceptions of problems and methods of problem solving which show increasing success over time as an index of a problem solving capacity. For the purposes of research and analysis across the nine sites, one would look for similarities in such patterns across sites in the same basic groups or subgroups of people. This paper will attempt to develop this general idea by identifying particular capacities for solving certain kinds of problems for a single subgroup in the local schools of the nine sites documented by DTA. Principals were selected for this analysis for several reasons:

1. Principals are acknowledged as the legal authority and leader of the school.

2. Principals are in a pivotal position between the local school and its larger context which allows the analysis to examine school issues which are both internal to the local school as well as external.
3. Technical assisters usually assume that the principal can markedly facilitate or hinder change in the school.
4. The possibility of a lack of consensus in perception or diversity among administrators in a single school might be circumvented by using a single leader among them.

This paper will examine through descriptive analysis, the problems which school principals perceive in their schools, the way in which principals conceive of problems, and the methods of which they and members of the school community address those problems. This basic analysis will be done in each school. Comparisons and contrasts will be built across the nine sites in an attempt to determine patterns of perceptions and behavior which will enhance our understanding of capacities for solving certain kinds of problems.

It is understood that this analysis is only one of several ways to understand the role of the principal in a capacity for problem solving even within the DTA project. In a cross-site analysis of the facilitation of capacity, Lenoir (1977) has focused upon how the schools' principals in the nine sites act as political leaders (jugglers of external forces), as internal facilitators of problem solving, as allocators of resources (human and material), and as initiators and implementors of actions. Both of these analyses of principals in the DTA study can be useful to technical assisters working directly or indirectly with principals. They can show important distinctions among principals to which technical assisters ought to be sensitive. These differences may be in terms of their values and inclinations, the way they perceive their role, their perceptions of problems, what they consider appropriate methods of solving problems, etc.

The body of this paper will be devoted to an attempt to show the different capacities found for solving or working toward solutions for various kinds of problems experienced by the principals in this study. The next section in this introductory chapter reviews some of the pertinent research on the problems of principals and role functioning which relates to the problems and problem solving of principals in this study. After this introduction to the literature the methodology of the paper as part of the DTA study will be described. Next, a brief description of each of the principals of this study and their schools will be presented to give the reader some familiarity with the context in which to place the subsequent analysis and data of the paper. An analysis section follows which gives a framework of problems of the principals derived from the data. Finally, the major findings related to a capacity for problem solving which joins the framework of problems with the methods of problem solving will be introduced. Five major analysis chapters follow addressing the problem areas of the framework and giving data from the sites individually to illustrate the capacities for solving problems in these five problem areas. A concluding note is given suggesting the implications of the study.

Previous Research on Problems and Role Functioning of Principals

When one reviews work written about principals, one is struck by two related findings. First, the majority of the writing is prescriptive, suggesting certain behaviors or training for behaviors appropriate for principals, rather than empirical, examining what principals do and think. Second, there is generally a presumption that the principalship is virtually standard throughout all schools; the school building administrator has certain managerial and educational functions of the role which should be performed similarly in any and all schools. It would seem of considerable value to analyze systematically the prescriptions of writers (preferably of principals or former principals) in the hope of generating a cohesive lore* of successful role behavior. Such a collection of experience, if sensitive to personal differences in values, beliefs, and attitudes of people and to situational differences in schools (e.g. urban, rural or suburban; small clearly identifiable community versus large dispersed community; small elementary school versus large secondary school; etc.) might usefully guide the practice of administrators and technical assisters. The awesome task of developing such a body of accumulated knowledge or lore will be left to another writer. Here will be mentioned a few studies which appear to be empirical or descriptive of the actual thought and/or action of principals and try to relate these to specific personal or situational contexts of principals. This review is intended to suggest problems of principals and possible methods of solving them.

A national study conducted by McPherson and his colleagues (1975) was designed to examine among principals the "interrelatedness of job function and a variety of contextual circumstances." After extensive pilot testing and development, a self-report instrument, the Job Functions Inventory, was successfully administered to over six hundred principals in a wide range of settings. Multivariate analyses of variance and factor analysis were done on the principals' responses yielding several significant findings. The greatest number of differences in the way principals described their job functions were attributable to type and size of school, socioeconomic status and ethnic composition of students, and ethnic composition of teaching staff. While they did not report interactions among variables, they did report the following:

---

* Lore is meant to denote the accumulated knowledge and tradition based upon the experieces of the practitioners themselves.

> principals of smaller schools seem to be more involved with the students themselves - their personal adjustment problems and safety and associated utilization of specialized staff. Principals of larger schools more closely resemble managers in other institutions in dealing with staffing and union issues and, at policy levels, with personnel issues (McPherson and Salley, 1975).

They found that principals of racially mixed and minority group schools placed a high priority on dealing with problems of gangs and racial and ethnic groups. However, principals of predominantly white schools emphasized interaction with parents, residents and organizations in the community, the development of school organizations and extra-curricular activities, the development of curricula, and the strengthening of collegial contacts. The study also generated via a second-order factor analysis four different approaches principals take to the complexity of their role:

> Factor A pictures the principal who places high priority on the involvement and support of groups - community groups, such as parents, local agencies and religious organizations, or groups within the educational administrative structure, such as the central office.
>
> Factor B depicts the principal who emphasizes the evaluation and improvement of student academic performance through the use of internally developed or standardized evaluation tests, effective utilization of instructional materials and efficient deployment of specialized staff.

> Factor C represents the principal who stresses the development of qualified teaching staff through personal involvement in hiring them, coaching them on their handling of student problems, evaluating their performance and, if necessary on the basis of this evaluation firing those who perform unsatisfactorily.
>
> Factor D portrays the principal who stresses a managerial approach, involving tight fiscal control and close working relationships with the central office (McPherson, et al., 1975).

The reader should not assume that each principal subscribes only to a single factor.

Dreeben and Gross (1965) examined the effect of role behavior of principals on the operation of the school. They defined role behavior as "a pattern of actions in which individuals cope with problematic issues inherent in organizational life." Data were obtained from 501 principals (as well as 172 higher administrators and 3,367 teachers who worked with them) in 41 cities with populations over 50,000. The problematic issues of concern to Gross were principal's closeness of supervision, support of innovation, and involvement of parents in school affairs. Variations in school level were the major contextual aspect of the school organization considered, i.e. elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Three areas indicative of effectiveness in school operations were assessed, viz, staff morale, effort of teachers, and the students' learning.

Significant positive relationships were found at the junior high level between all indices of principals' actions in the problematic issues (closeness of supervision, support of innovation, parental involvement) and all indices of effectiveness (teachers' morale and effort and students' learning). At the elementary school level positive relationships were found for all three indices of principal's actions and teacher effort; between support of innovations and parental involvement and teacher morale (closeness of supervision and teacher morale were not significantly related); and between closeness of supervision and student learning (innovation and involvement were not significantly related to student learning). At the high school level positive relationships were found for all three indices of principals' actions and both teacher morale and effort but only closeness of supervision was positively related to student learning (innovation and involvement were not significantly related).

Several studies, looking at elementary schools and their principals, will be considered next. Mascaro (1976) found that first year elementary school principals who held expectations of effecting school change through their own involvement in teachers' classrooms were in a "problematic situation" because their perspective of the new role clashed with the time demands of meetings, paperwork, student discipline, and parent conferences. They resolved the problem by developing a new perspective to cope with the situation. Instead of getting into the classroom (substantive involvement with educational processes), they came to go in and out of the classroom (limited observation). Mascaro derives his analysis of "perspectives" and "problematic situations" from Howard Becker and his colleagues (1961).

Gerald Becker and his colleagues (1971) set out to determine the perceptions of members of a national representational sample of 300 elementary school principals on their problems in administering their schools. A categorization of potential problems made from a review of the literature on elementary school administration (consisting of thirty-six problems arranged in six areas) was used as a basis for inquiry in data collection via interviews and questionnaires. The six problem areas were: school and society, pupil personnel, instructional program, administrative leadership, organizational texture, and finances and facilities.

Findings showed that in the problem area of school and society, community influence and public relations were paramount concerns. In the problem area of pupil personnel the largest concerns were for the "inability of both teachers and administrators to recognize individual differences and to adjust the instructional programs to meet the needs of the individual student" (P.40). In the problem area of the instructional program greatest concerns were for personnel selection, placement, and supervision. In the problem area of administrative leadership, role identification, i.e. a lack of a well-defined role and insufficient recognition by the community and district administrators were primary concerns. In the area of organizational texture, exclusion from district policy-making processes was the largest concern. Finally, in the area of finances and facilities, the biggest problem was the state of the school building. When inner city principals were compared with all others, their results were the same in all concerns with only one exception; they had the additional concern of management of students in the area of pupil personnel. For all principals, including inner city principals, the largest percentage of problems cited centered on personnel selection, placement, and supervision (accounting for about 35% of major problems cited).

Becker also described the common characteristics of the principals who he defined as having successfully addressed these problems:

1) Most did not intend to be principals, but were teachers who became principals at their superiors' urging. 2) They had a sincere faith in children's ability to learn. 3) They had an ability to work effectively and cooperatively with teachers, parents, and students, listening well and empathically, accepting teachers as competent and inspiring confidence and enthusiasm. 4) They were aggressive in securing recognition for needs of the school, including being critical of the school system and seeking additional resources beyond it. 5) They accepted their responsibilities as a mission rather than a job. 6) They had an established philosophy of the role of education and the principal's role with short and long term goals. 7) They were adaptable, that is, they could shift to a new plan if something was not working. 8) They acted as strategists, identifying objectives and planning appropriate procedures. Therefore, Becker and his colleagues delineate kinds of problems of principals and aspects of efficacious role functioning.

Doll (1969) conducted several studies which focused on inner-city elementary schools and their principals. He studied areas of the inner city where most schools were characterized by faculty and administrators in the course of intensive interviews as being "overwhelmed by the social and behavioral problems of many of their students. Discipline problems, overt and covert hostility towards teachers, lack of self control, lack of experiences and background needed for success in school..." (p.13). Yet within these areas. individual schools stood out as being significantly successful in their educational missions. A major factor in these better schools was seen to be the behavior of the principal. Doll said,

> The "successful" principals appeared to be those who (1) showed a willingness to move independently and decisively in matters affecting the faculty or school; (2) had a genuine empathy for the teaching staff and the residents of the neighborhood as well as an ability to show his empathy in a non-condescending manner; and (3) had a perception of the principal's role as one whose primary task is to assist teachers to teach, even if it meant clashing with the wishes of the administrative hierarchy (p.18).

Doll also noted that a second factor was the grade level of the school. He noted that K-6 schools were more successful in dealing with student behavior than K-8 schools.

Cross and Burnett (1969) examined problems of principals using a taxonomy of administrative problems of elementary school principals in different socioeconomic settings. The taxonomy separates the functions of educational administration into managing the school, developing personnel, community relations and educational programs. Problem types were categorized as either technical, human, or conceptual and as originating from others in the hierarchy (intermediary), from appeals and requests from subordinates or outsiders (appellate), or from within his administration (creative). They found that

> "... principals of low socio-economic schools appear to be forced into the role of the counter punching manager who is under pressure from human relations problems. The high number of problems of an appellate nature (60.9%) indicates that the majority of actions of principals in low socio-economic settings were reactions to the initiative of others. ...A principal who is bombarded with appellate problems has little time to generate creative problems (p.15-16).

Principals in low socioeconomic school settings relative to those in high settings spend significantly more time in human and appellate problems, in community relations and managing the school, and, perhaps consequently, less on educational programs and on technical, conceptual and creative problems.

Two studies of secondary school principals should be noted. McClearly (1971) found that principals of twenty-two urban secondary schools have experienced an attrition in their role in terms of domain and scope of influence, sources of organizational power, and bases of authority. He found wide variations in the functioning of principals which did not support the idealized role description one finds in the literature. These variations could not be attributable to district size (i.e. the number of high schools in the district). McClearly conceived of the principal's role shifting from "educational values to educational mechanics" under pressure from both central office staff and teachers' unions. Vidich & McReynolds (1969, 1971) report similar findings from intensive interviews and seminars with New York High School principals. The rise of the United Federation of Teachers was seen to encroach on the ability of the principal to work out arrangements informally with colleagues. The increasing bureaucratization of the school system was a further encroachment on the principal's perogatives with regard to hiring teachers and substitutes. They see principals' time being "monopolized by the press of immediate managerial imperatives" (Vidich and McReynolds, 1971, p.200) such as managing a large cafeteria, scheduling, collecting information and preparing reports for superiors, being the final arbiter in discipline and organizational problems, and representing the school to its publics. In addition, these principals expressed great displeasure with the increasing political and social influence of the community in education in the late 1960's, which to them ought to be the province of professional educators.

While there are individual nuances to each of these studies which bear a reader's careful review, there are some commonalities in problems and methods which will be mentioned in summary. Across levels of schools there seems to be a pressure upon principals most acutely felt, perhaps, by the high school principal to attend to primarily administrative functions of the role. Emphasis on managerial problems concerning staff replacement and supervision as well as maintaining the school physical plant appear to be dictated by the central administrations' expectations. Within the school, principals are continuously forced to address the human relations problems of students and teachers which are brought to them. Principals varied considerably in their personal convictions as to the nature of community and parental involvement in the school and, therefore, varied in what they thought the problems of such involvement to be.

There seem to be very different ways of performing the role which defy clear cut associations between contexts and problems. The basic managerial notion of the role seems most frequently used in the large urban secondary schools. The focus upon student concerns and teachers' needs seems most apparent in principals of small elementary schools. Principals' functioning with the community and parents of the school appears to vary with individual values. Principals' relationships with teachers with the rise of unionism also appears to be most strained in larger secondary schools. Finally, there is a suggestion of successful elementary school principals acting somewhat independently of central administrative authority on behalf of the school in solving problems.

Sources of Data and Methods of Cross-Site Analysis

As was mentioned earlier, primary data collection and analysis for the documentation of the funded strategies in the nine sites was performed primarily by site researchers in conjunction with research oordinators. S. Wilson (1977) describes in detail the research methodology. The basic materials of documentation included interviews (mostly audio tape-recorded and transcribed), documents of a wide variety, and observational field notes. The field notes were abstracted into Field Data Forms for entering into a computerized retrieval system. While site researchers spent much of the initial year studying the operation of the TAG and its funded strategy in the school, the second year was spent mostly in studying the school to ascertain the impact of the strategy.

There was great variability among site researchers in the amount of data collected on the functioning of the principals in the schools under study, largely due to variation in the focus of the TAG's strategy. Some TAGs were directly attempting to train the principals, while others were only indirectly concerned with their roles. It was decided to concentrate the secondary analysis, which is the function of this paper, on the six projects in which site researchers had collected the most comprehensive data about principals. Therefore, the analysis was performed upon nine principals, one each in three sites and two each in the remaining three sites.

In order to perform the analysis of this paper a variety of data sources were used. The original data (interviews, documents, and FDFs) collected by site researchers were analyzed. Also several analytical papers, memoranda, and case studies written by site researchers were reviewed. The site researchers also collected some additional data on principals in the winter and spring of 1977 in accord with the attempt to focus the secondary analysis on particular issues. The writer, a research coordinator, personnally interviewed several principals and analyzed articles and papers written by these principals. Finally, DTA sponsored a seminar for principals in the study, in which ideas and practices were exchanged, yielding additional self-report data.

The DTA Study: The Principals and Their Schools

Before entering the analysis of the problems and methods of problem solving of principals in the DTA study the reader may profit from a brief sketch of the principals and their schools. Pseudonyms for people, schools, and places have been used in this and in subsequent sections of the paper.

River City - Washington School - Ned Winter (6)

Ned Winter has been principal of Washington School for five years. He was appointed its principal by the superintendent when River City was in the midst of a large scale experiment in developing largely affective teaching processes and in instituting Neighborhood School Boards (or mini-boards) for parent involvement in local schools. He served for the three years prior to this principalship in the central administration of River City directing the training of teachers in the affective teaching processes. With a strong background in counseling at school and college level and teaching counseling in colleges, he was committed to the philosophy of humanistic education as articulated by Carl Rogers. Ten years prior to his principalship at Washington he had spent several years as a principal of rural schools. He is now in his early fifties.

Winter and the parents of Washington Elementary School renamed it Washington Community School when they legally incorporated their Neighborhood School Board. The day school, as they often call it, serves 612 students from the lower socioeconomic community of Fishtown. Eighty percent of the students are white, 20% Black.

New York - Responsive Education - School A - Carlos Chavez (8)

Carlos Chavez became the first Puerto Rican principal of a New York school after he brought a legal suit which successfully challenged the licensing regulations of principals. He was appointed by the regional community school board with strong backing from parents. He has a definite personal commitment to the philosophy of open education as articulated by Marian Barber. He was formerly principal and teacher in elementary schools in New York and is now in his mid-forties.

School A is an elementary school located in a markedly varied community with many languages, cultures, ethnic groups. It also varies widely in economic level. The school serves about 950 students of which about 25% are Black, 41% Hispanic, and 31% white.

New York - Responsive Education - School B - Ted Harrison (8)

Ted Harrison has been appointed principal of School B twice by the parents' recommendation to the regional community school board. On the first occasion in 1968 he had participated as a teacher and mathematics coordinator in the parent-run schools during teachers' strikes in New York. The close working relationships with teachers led him to become an active proponent of the parent sponsored open education programs of Marian Barber. He was the first community appointed principal in New York and served five years at School B before accepting another principalship elsewhere. He returned less than two years later in the midst of the fiscal crises of New York at the request of many of the parents. He is now in his early forties.

School B is an elementary school located in a culturally heterogeneous community in the same regional district as School A. Its student population numbers a little more than 1000 of which 20% are Black, 33% Hispanic, and 42% white.

New York - East Town High School - Tom Torzewski (9)

Tom Torzewski was trained as a business administrator with advanced degrees in economics. Having worked in the central administration of New York's schools for several years, he became a consultant to a New Jersey county's administration. He had many friends among the political and educational elites in New York. He came to East Town High School in 1971 at about age fifty as the business administrator of the school with virtually no duties concerning educational matters. He worked with the staff of the community corporation, the Neighborhood Corporation for Educational Improvement (NCEI) which developed East Town High School, to get continued funding for both the school and NCEI. He was thrust into the principalship of the school with the sabbatical and subsequent resignation of the principal three years ago.

East Town High School has been classified here as an alternative high school, however it was begun as an experimental school where adolescents and adults could both participate. It was also to be a precursor to a 4000 pupil school which was not built. Thus, East Town High School serves over 100 evening students (most adults) and about 450 day students of whom 33% are Black, 59% are Hispanic, and 8% are white.

New York - Southend I.S. - Abraham Plotnikov (2)

Abe Plotnikov served as a teacher and social studies department chairman in several junior high schools in New York for over fifteen years before becoming the head of a mini-school unit within the new Southend Intermediate School. When the assistant principal of the school expressed hostility towards the mini-school unit, Plotnikov enlisted the support of parents on behalf of the project. At Plotnikov's urging, three of these parents ran for and were elected to the regional community school board. Six months later when Southend's principal retired, Plotnikov was appointed principal of the school by the board. Now in his mid-fifties, he has been principal at Southend for four years.

Southend I.S. has had a declining enrollment serving about 900 students from the lower socioeconomic communities around the school. The student population is 30% Black and 69% Hispanic.

Federal City - Stanton Junior High School - Alvin Gross (7)

Al Gross is now in his early forties. He has been in junior high schools in Federal City for over fifteen years serving first as a science teacher in one, as an administrative intern in another, as an assistant principal in a third, as an acting principal in a fourth, and finally serving as an assistant principal at Stanton for three years. He was appointed to the principalship of Stanton four years ago upon the retirement of the principal.

The student population of Stanton has been declining in recent years. It now serves about 600 students, 80% of whom are Black, 3% Hispanic, and 17% white. Most of the white students are drawn from a cross-town Air Force base.

Federal City - Wood Junior High School - James Clark (7)

Jim Clark has also served in junior high schools in Federal City for almost fifteen of his forty years. He taught social studies for five years and was also a building representative for the teachers union. Next, he served for a year as the educational director of a residential treatment center for emotionally disturbed boys before becoming an assistant principal of two other junior high schools covering a five year span. With the reputation of a strong administrator he was asked to come to Wood Junior High School four years ago as its principal to clean up what was considered the worst junior high school in Federal City.

Wood Junior High School serves over 1800 students from the community which surrounds the school. Virtually all of its students are Black.

New York - James K. Polk High School - Irving Lewis (1)

Irving Lewis spent over twenty-four years teaching social studies and in administrating in New York High Schools before assuming the principalship of Polk High School. He held that post for five years before retiring recently. He was at Polk for the previous seven years as an assistant principal. Those were probably twelve of the most turbulent years in the history of New York High Schools. The student population of Polk changed dramatically from white to minority students at that time. Lewis served an additional seven years as an assistant principal at another school prior to coming to Polk.

Polk High School serves about 3500 students from New York but draws largely from the poor community of Southend. Its student population is 40% Black, 58% Hispanic and 2% white.

New York - Dolly Madison High School - Sarah Brinski (1)

Sarah Brinski is the lone woman in the study. Now in her mid-forties, she was a registered nurse and a biology and general science teacher before becoming an assistant principal at Dolly Madison High School. She served there several years andwhen the principal was removed by the superintendent she was appointed as the new principal.

Madison High School serves about 3500 students from New York. Its student population is 50% Black, 40% Hispanic and 10% white.

An Analytical Framework of Problems

What Did Principals Perceive Their Problems to Be?

The analysis of the data on the principals' perceptions of their problems will be portrayed by arranging specific problems into major areas according to how principals in the study conceived of their problems. This is a rather different procedure than the grouping of problems by researchers cited in the literature. For instance, assume one finds two different principals each with a similar "problem", their school buildings need repairs. One might categorize both problems under "Building". However, for one principal the real problem is that the school districts' Building and Grounds Department will not do repairs whereas the other principal sees that his school's maintenance man is avoiding his responsibilities. Thus, for this study these would be considered two different kinds of problems.

Five major problem areas were arranged to portray the kinds of distinctions principals made about their problems.

1. Problems of Securing Support for the School: handling the relations the local school has with forces and groups "external" to the narrowly defined, local school community (i.e. parents, school boards, and district administrators). Support has a dual connotation - on whom the principal relies for direction and sanction as well as from where the principal obtains additional resources for the school.
2. Problems of Governing the School: making decisions and sharing decision making power for policies within the local school.
3. Problems of Developing Curriculum and Staff in the School: building curricular programs and improving instruction.
4. Problems of Administering the School: managing the administrative procedures to support policies and programs.
5. Problems of Mediating Human Relations in the School: facilitating interpersonal relations and resolving conflict within the school.

While these five areas express some basic distinctions principals make concerning kinds of problems, the categorization also allows analysis of some issues and concepts which the writer feels have been clouded in the literature. First, by looking at problems of securing support can one assess to which group external to the local school do principals give their allegiance? That is, as people and as professional educators to whom do principals look for their mandate in running the school or, if you would, whom do they consider to be their employer? Second, by examining problems of governing the school one can analyze how principals deal with the issues of shared decision making and community control of local schools: whom do the principals involve in decision making, in what decisions, in what way? Third, by looking at problems of developing curriculum and staff, one can determine operationally what a principal is as an educator or a pedagogue, or an instructional leader. What do they specifically do to directly foster curricular and instructional improvement? Fourth, from examining the problems of administering the school, one can ascertain the differences between governance and management, between policy setting and implementation, and between educating and administrating within the individual school. Fifth, by looking at problems of mediating human relations, one can determine how the leader establishes basic interpersonal processes in the school. There should be noted a flow across these areas: a sense of direction, emanating in part from outside the school, influencing the internal governance of the school as policies are made to facilitate programs and processes, which must be implemented and supported administratively and must be concerned with the interpersonal relations of teachers and students. These five problem areas will represent the different kinds of problems for which particular capacities for solving may exist.

Unfortunately, comprehensive data do not exist in each of the five areas for the nine principals being analyzed. The area of greatest weakness seems to be concerning human relations problems. Ironically, the literature would suggest that this is an area in which the principal personally spends much of his time. It is felt that the research focus on funded strategies of TAGs fostered a systematic bias toward the other problem areas in the sites.

Are All Problems Created Equal?

Clearly, problems vary in quite a number of ways, S. Wilson (1977) discusses the nature of problems. Within each of the five areas of problems mentioned the perceived severity of the problem is an important factor which may aid in our understanding of capacities for problem solving. For descriptive purposes this paper distinguishes between "problematic situations" and "crises". The former would be problems of a rather normal discrepancy between the current and ideal state of affairs which a principal has come to expect in some form; the latter is a severe problem where the current state is definitely disturbing (e.g. has become worse, further from the ideal than it was). Thus, the problematic situation is somewhat analogous to the difficulty in maintaining the current rate of moving the current state (the "is") towards the ideal state (the "ought-to-be"). However, the crisis is more like a serious difficulty in maintaining the current state itself.

A third kind of problem may be seen in the data from these nine schools. These are problems where the principal and others in the school have an important sense of where the school "ought to be". Their conception of the ideal state of affairs powerfully motivates their perceptions of the current state and guides their action. Problems of this type will be called "visions". It is important that one not assume that visions mean "goals". The term goals in education has come to connote a rather definitive statement of what one seeks to attain, a kind of product of one's efforts, with goal attainment based upon mutual goal agreement, strategic setting of objectives, and advancement by successively meeting objectives with formalized feedback loops guiding behavior. A vision is considerably more amorphous, process-oriented and subject to modification and development. It is more like a direction than a destination; metaphorically speaking, one goes west because that is the way the sun traverses the sky; one engages in the process of going west because it is an enjoyable journey; along the way one may go somewhat northwest for a while or southwest for a while, but will always move west. Clarity of vision would thus mean the certainty of one's direction, not the specification of destination. Furthermore, it would seem an important criterion that visions be states that are considered to be of value for themselves as opposed to being merely the opposite of a current unpleasant situation. To retain the earlier metaphor, in a vision one chooses to go west because of its inherent value not because one dislikes going east (for then one could just as readily go south or north instead of west).

The distinctions between the three types of problems are perhaps largely of emphasis. Visions emphasize the ideal state, problematic situations have a sense of the current relative to the ideal state, and crises emphasize the current state. A reiteration of a basic premise is warranted: problems are created by people's perceptions of their situations formed in large measure by their values and beliefs. Actions or methods of problem solving based on these perceptions of problems will similarly reflect the distinction between the three types: visions call for active behavior in order to actualize the desired states, crises call for reactive behavior in order to regain lost ground, and problematic situations call for coping behaviors in order to keep pace with changes.

What Kinds of Problems Did Principals Have?

The data of this study do not constitute an exhaustive enumeration of all the problems of these nine principals over the two years of documentation. The problems were arranged for analysis as they were perceived, conceived and addressed in the sites by the principals on whom the site researchers had gathered relatively complete data. Individual cases of problems were analyzed and grouped with others to form the basic analytical framework described by the five problem areas and the three problem types for each principal. Thus, an effort was made to find commonalities in perception and action within the framework for each principal separately. A general picture of these patterns can be seen in the following chart, Figure 1. Within each cell of the matrix is given the type of problem for which examples were found in the data for that principal. No claim is made that other types of problems did not exist for the principal, but rather that the research was relatively able to document completely problems of this type in these problem areas. Note that multiple types occur in some cells. The principals have been arranged in approximate order of the size of the school.

Review of the matrix reveals some facts which may speak either of the selectivity of data collection, as related to TAG emphases, or to inclinations of principals'perception and behavior. Let us assume that the patterns are suggestive of the latter, that is, what site researchers documented reflects the most significant and basic problems of principals. The following patterns should be noteworthy. The first four principals, from the three elementary schools and the alternative high school, had

FIGURE 1 PROBLEM TYPES BY AREA FOR THE NINE PRINCIPALS

Problem Areas

Principal	Type of School	Securing Support	Governing	Developing C & S	Administering	Mediating H.R.	Totals
Winter	Elementary	Vision	Vision	Vision		Vision	4
		P.S.			P.S.		2
		Crisis					1
Chavez	Elementary	Vision	Vision	Vision			3
		P.S.			P.S.	P.S.	3
		Crisis					1
Harrison	Elementary	Vision	Vision	Vision			3
		P.S.			P.S.	P.S.	3
		Crisis					1
Torzewski	Alt. High S.	Vision	Vision	Vision			3
		P.S.			P.S.		2
		Crisis	Crisis	Crisis		Crisis	4
Plotnikov	Int. J.H.S.			Vision			1
		P.S.	P.S.		P.S.	P.S.	4
		Crisis					1
Gross	J. H. S.			Vision			1
		P.S.	P.S.		P.S.	P.S.	4
		Crisis					1
Clark	J. H. S.						0
		P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	P.S.		4
		Crisis				Crisis	2
Lewis	High School						0
		P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	3
							0
Brinski	High School						0
		P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	P.S.	5
							0
Totals	Visions	4	4	6	0	1	15
	P.S.	9	5	3	9	6	32
	Crisis	7	1	1	0	2	11

virtually all of the visions listed in the matrix (with these visions centering on the first three problem areas). Also, the large majority of crises can be seen in the first problem area of securing support for the school. All of the principals evidenced problematic situations in this area which was due to their active search for additional resources for the school. The only principals not seen as having crises of support are the two New York high school principals. Perhaps some would dispute the contention that the fiscal crisis in New York was not a crisis in support for these schools. However, the intent here is to view the situation from the principal's viewpoint. That is, to teachers in these schools the fiscal crisis of the city caused a crisis for them in teacher lay-offs and transfers and in morale (a human relations problem), but not for the principals who viewed these as problematic situations, difficult, unfortunate, but nonetheless a problematic situation not a crisis. Also of note is the recording of neither crisis nor visions for these principals, only problematic situations. In fact, the five principals at the bottom of the chart, representing the traditional secondary schools, are largely characterized by problematic situations with relatively few visions or crises. A final note might be made of the six cells of the matrix in which both visions and crises may be seen. Such a configuration represents a great tension wherein one would imagine events and forces not of ones making pulling a principal away from the quest of a vision to attend to the dire exigencies of the current state of affairs. Three of these were experienced by Torzewski in a school with ambitious ideas and with severe problems. Four of these can be seen in the area of securing support. As will be shown later, they characterize visions of community and parent participation in the school juxtaposed with crises either in the school district or emanating from the central administration.

Now that the problems of principals have been established, the major findings concerning capacities for problem solving will be addressed which will show methods by which these kinds of problems were solved.

Major Findings

There were two major findings of this study that relate to capacities for problem solving: one is general, relating to problem types, and the other is specific, relating to each of the five problem areas. The first finding is that visions foster problem perception and problem solving methods of particular efficacy. The somewhat limited sample from which this notion is drawn does warrant considering the finding suggestive rather than conclusive. As mentioned earlier, most of the visions in the study were held by four principals, three of elementary schools and one of an alternative secondary school. Also the holding of these visions may differ somewhat with the level of the schools. The elementary schools have younger children with educational needs unlike those of the students in the secondary schools. Furthermore elementary schools have smaller and more distinct parent communities than the secondary schools.

The power of visions lies in facilitating a rapid articulation of the discrepancy between ideal and current states (i.e. if you have a good sense of the direction in which you want to head, it may be easier to tell when you are off course than if you are merely meandering). When a principal and others shared visions which emphasized where they wanted to go with the school, they seemed more sensitive to when the school was deviating from the course than principals who did not have as clear a sense of what they wanted. The latter were more apt to allow themselves to be shaped by others' notions of the ideal state or to allow a lack of clarity about the ideal state to continue. Furthermore, in the solving of problems, perceptions born of visions spurred the actualizing of educational, social, cultural, and political ideals for the school and community. Thus to those involved, the visions provided clear mandates for strategies, since unlike goals, visions are process-oriented. The visions acted as a powerful force which provoked action on behalf of ideas and acted as a kind of sensor for awareness or mindfulness of one's situation. Visions also carried with them commitments to the ideals of the visions, and in several cases induced risk-taking by the principal on behalf of the ideals, for instance, fighting one's own school district.

The second finding relates to the kinds of capacities for solving problems in the five problem areas. The following might express what was found:

1. A capacity for solving problems of securing support for the school would be - (a) establishing a firm basis for direction and sanction external to the local school in either the community or parents (local or regional) or in the school district administration (regional or central); if in the community, it means providing multiple avenues for participation in the life of the school and (at times) fighting the school system politically and legally on behalf of the community's school; if in the district, it means working with and manipulating the system on behalf of the school. (b) getting additional resources for the school beyond the normal school district allotment.

2. A capacity for solving problems of governing the school would be - (a) involving divergent groups appropriately in decision making via formal and/or informal structures; if parents and community are involved, it means providing information and (often) specialized training. (b) getting the support of the divergent groups through either balancing or integrating their special interests.

3. A capacity for solving problems of developing curriculum and staff would be - (a) leading the school in development according to a personally known and held rationale (philosophical or practical) or (b) delegating responsibility and authority for development to one who can lead in that manner.

4. A capacity for solving problems of administering the school would be - (a) conceiving of the whole school's tasks and delegating to others and selecting for self tasks according to people's talents for an optimal overall balance or fit. (b) making administrative arrangements based on the educational programs of curriculum and teaching one is trying to develop, not on administrative expediency.

5; A capacity for solving problems of mediating human relations would be-establishing and enforcing a system of preventative and punitive student behavior policies based on a personally known and held rationale (philosophical or practical).

In the following five sections each of these capacities for problem solving will be illustrated by discussing the general issues and data which led to their formulation. Next, a descritpive analysis of the individual schools and principals will be given in the following manner which corresponds to the chart of problem types by area as shown in Figure 1. First, for each of the problem areas (e.g. Securing Support for the School) the data of all principals with visions will be sequentially presented in each case stating the nature of the problem (the visions) followed by the methods used to solve the problems (actualize the vision).

Second, will be presented the crises in similar sequence of principals plus problems and methods. Last, will be presented the problematic situations for each principal again with problems and methods. In the conclusion the significance and implications of the major findings will be discussed.

CHAPTER II: PROBLEMS OF SECURING SUPPORT FOR THE SCHOOL

CHAPTER II: PROBLEMS OF SECURING SUPPORT FOR THE SCHOOL

Page

A. From whom did the principals derive direction and support?............38

B. How did the principals promote parent and community participation?....41

C. How did the principal deal with the school system?...................42

D. What kinds of additional resources did principals import?.............43

E. Visions concerning securing support for the school....................46

F. Crises concerning securing support for the school.....................53

G. Problematic situations concerning securing support for the school.....62

PROBLEMS OF SECURING SUPPORT FOR THE SCHOOL

It was previously stated that a capacity for solving problems of securing support for the school would be

(a) establishing a firm basis for direction and sanction external to the local school in either the community or parents (local or regional) or in the school district administration (regional or central); if in the community it means providing multiple avenues for participation in the life of the school and (at times) fighting the school system politically and legally on behalf of the community's school; if in the district it means working with and manipulating the system on behalf of the school.

(b) getting additional resources for the school beyond the normal school district allotment.

This basic thesis was formed from the analysis of the data on the visions, crises, and problematic situations of the nine principals and the methods they used to solve these problems. This particular capacity for problem solving can be best understood by examining four basic questions. After these questions are discussed, data for each of the types of problems for the sites will be presented.

From Whom Did the Principals Derive Direction and Support?

It appears that at sometime in their careers in education, either prior to or after becoming principals, the principals made a decision as to where they would place their allegiance in deriving direction for the school and support for themselves as leaders. While all held positions of authority sanctioned by the educational hierarchy, some chose other sources for their primary allegiance while some did not look beyond that hierarchy. The allegiances used by principals were: the parents and community members of the local school, the regional school board (made up of members of a somewhat larger community), the regional school district (an administrative decentralization), and the central school district administration. Figure 2, which follows, shows these allegiances as well as the part of the school district hierarchy to which the principals were immediately accountable. When a local school board with quasi-legal status existed for the individual school it is indicated by (LSB).

The allegiance of the first four principals in the figure to the parents and community of the school is in large measure attributable to their vision or desire to be responsive to this group, to make the school accessible to them, and to work for their involvement in school governance. As noted, two of these four had strong ties with the regional school board as they are both in a district with a history of politically and educationally sophisticated and active parents who were primarily responsible for their appointments to the schools. The other two principals have worked to maintain and develop the local school boards despite increasing pressure to the contrary from the central school district administration.

While these first four principals had some degree of political pressure to serve the clearly defined communities of these schools, each has demonstrated significant personal commitment to working with the parents and community of the local school that would seem to go beyond that needed to maintain their own standing. In contrast to these four are two principals of junior high schools, Plotnikov and Clark, in similar community situations who have worked with local parents and community only when necessary and to their own personal advantage. Plotnikov used several key old friends on the regional board for personal support which may be termed an allegiance only in a very special sense of the word. Clark, head of a large junior high with definite geographical and political community (including active

FIGURE 2

ALLEGIANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE PRINCIPALS

Principal	School type	Allegiance	Accountability
Winter	Elementary	Parents/Community	Central (LSB)
Chavez	Elementary	Par/Comm. & Regional School	Regional
Harrison	Elementary	Par/Comm. & Regional Board	Regional
Torzewski	Alternative H.S.	Parent/Community	Central (LSB)
Plotnikov	Int. (J.H.) School	Regional Board	Regional
Gross	Junior H.S.	Regional Dist. & Cent.	Regional
Clark	Junior H.S.	Regional Dist. & Cent.	Regional (LSB)
Lewis	High School	Central Administration	Central
Brinski	High School	Central Administration	Central

regional and local boards) maintained definite allegiance to the regional and central district administration lines of accountability. The third junior high school principal and the two high school principals have somewhat gerrymandered catchment areas with no clear community. They, like Clark, did not go beyond the school district administration in allegiance and followed the lines of accountability. For these principals and the other two junior high principals the "community" was an audience for which an image of the school needed to be built or created rather than an entity with which to work actively.

Thus, one can see the basic distinctions made here between the possible bases for direction and support: community or parents at either regional or local levels and the school district at either regional or central levels.

How Did the Principals Promote Parent and Community Participation?

The four principals who had strong allegiances with parents and community members desired the participation of these people in the life of the school. It appears that the three principals who were most successful in involving them provided many varied kinds of participation for them. The fourth principal, Torzewski, headed a school which historically provided only one real avenue for participation, school governance, in which very few parents wished to be involved. The general inaccessibility of urban public schools to parents has produced a situation in which principals and other professionals who desired more parental involvement and participation in the life of the school had to make special arrangements. They had to provide parent rooms which were solely for parents' use and had to establish various roles and legitimate activities in the school and the classroom in which parents with a wide range of interests might become engaged. Another DTA paper by Dollar (1977) presents a full treatment of participation in these four schools.

How Did the Principals Deal With the School System?

The problems that beset the principals in the area of securing support for the school seem mainly to center on dwindling resources allocated by the school system in the midst of fiscal crises and declining enrollments. Directly related to the question of, from whom does the principal derive direction, those principals who looked to the central and regional district administration seemed more accepting of their problems as facts of educational life and tried to work with the administrative hierarchy of the system (albeit, sometimes deviously) to get their allotted resources. In contrast, those principals who looked to the community were more active in fighting the system and in refusing to accept the pronouncements of allocations. As will be seen in the following section all principals in some way sought additional resources to supplement allocations.

The five principals who aligned themselves not with the parents and community but with school district administrators (or in the case of Plotnikov, with a few key members of the regional board) tended to work with the school system in terms of resources. However, each of the three junior high school principals have manipulated the system in terms of enrollment. Jim Clark got his demountable (portable) classrooms declared condemned via a requested inspection in order to reduce his large student population. Al Gross and Abe Plotnikov were both faced with the long range possibility of school closing because of population decline and initiated student recruitment campaigns via public relations with current and potential parent client groups. Also both cleverly used regional connections (Plotnikov with the board and Gross with the district) to enhance school longevity.

The four community oriented principals, however, were willing to actively fight the school system in areas they considered crucial to the school. They allied themselves with parents in protestations, political pressuring, and even legal battles. Usually they were successful. Most extreme of the instances of such fighting was the prolonged conflagration in River City when the central administration sought repeatedly through various devices to close the school. Legal and political maneuvering of some scope and ingenuity was orchestrated by the principal. A similar, though less dramatic and extensive, fight for retention of community control of the funding of East Town High School was waged by Tom Torzewski. The same basic tactics were used in the two New York elementary schools by parents with the principals' support on various occasions, particularly in refusing to accept a shortened school day.

Principals and parents have displayed not only the willingness to use lawyers, legal aid societies, and the courts but also an increasing understanding of their legal rights and the law. Chavez achieved his principalship via the courts, and he and the parents were quick to use them again to reinstate the school as deserving Title I funds after declassification. Winter and his students' parents insisted on their legal rights to have input on their Title I proposal when the central district administration moved to disallow it because of their input.

What Kinds of Additional Resources Did Principals Import?

All of these principals secured additional resources for their schools. Among the many varied additional resources principals brought to the schools, two basic kinds (funds and programs) seem to have been imported differentially according to the principals' orientations and the type of school. It should be noted that although each principal had avowed reasons of educational value for importing additional resources, as Sieber (1976) points out with regard to information, retrieval, there are many symbolic reasons for such behavior. Increased status and visibility for career enhancement can undoubtedly result from successful fund-raising and program importing. In fact the principals studied by DTA may constitute a special sample in this regard. They either solicited the NIE grant or were chosen by their district for it on the basis of some distinction.

The principals who desired to involve the community also had visions for developing educational programs based on some particular philosophy. They tended to seek funds for the development of these programs which would allow more scope than permitted by the usual budget allotments. Added to these four active fund-raisers would be a fifth principal, Abe Plotnikov. Though not having the same community orientation, he too had a vision for educational programs and sought special funding. These principals wrote proposals personally and with others, as well as used their personal contacts to secure funding for program development. Grants and special discretionary funds were obtained from foundations, federal, state and local sources as well as from private donations.

Within this group of five fund-raisers a further distinction can be seen. The two principals with the strongest community ties and local control of funding, Winter and Torzewski, solicited funds for community development and social service projects with the school as a focal point. However, the other three used the additional funding for school projects exclusively.

The other principals, all with regional and central district ties, tended to bring into their schools district-sponsored curricular projects. Although the NIE grant was used for curricular development via direct funds to the schools, much discussion ensued as to the advisability of importing a curricular project developed elsewhere. As will be seen in a subsequent section, the need for successful varied curricula is a paramount concern to at least two of these four principals.

In addition to the two major kinds of additional resources, funds and programs, principals with regional or central district connections used their contacts for other smaller resources. A few extra teacher allotments might be obtained. Additional staff development days might be approved. Individual teachers or assistant principals removed due to budget cuts might be restored. Seniority and posting regulations might be bypassed to retain someone about to be cut or transferred. Special curricular projects might be piloted in the school. For these principals working within the system provided small rewards scattered throughout the school year.

The capacity for solving problems in the area of securing support for the school is complex as it reflects dual notions of support and very different perspectives among principals. Principals required both fiscal support for the school and personal support in terms of direction and sanction for their leadership in the school. All principals were successful in obtaining additional resources for the school. Yet, principals varied considerably in the methods of solving the problems of securing personal support. Two basic problem solving approaches were taken differentially by these principals. The more common as judged by the review of research was the principal who worked within the system in a somewhat manipulative fashion, using contacts and connections within the school district. The other approaches, used by principals whose primary allegiance was to the parents and community, was to work with the parents and community for the local school against the larger school district, occasionally through political and legal means. The successful development of the latter problem solving approach appeared to be in part dependent on providing many ways for parents to become part of the school's life.

Visions Concerning Securing Support for the School

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

Ned Winter's vision of parent involvement in running a humanistic elementary school broadened within the school as a focus for community education which would promote the personal growth of parents, students, and community members. The professionals should be, according to Winter, "working themselves out of jobs" by empowering the community. In an interview with this author, Winter recalled:

> I guess when I started here I had a vision but it has evolved...(at first) I wanted to see a rather humanistic school where kids were treated like people rather than objects...a very happy school where kids were happy about learning instead of considering it work and I wanted to see parents become involved in the kids' education. I don't think my vision five years ago encompassed community education at all other than bringing parents into the building working with kids and making decisions around the all day school.
>
> ...The concept (of community education) is just about three years old in our heads....The community was definitely around us...but we weren't doing anything about it...we wrote the big, mammoth community ed. proposal, not submitting it to anyone. We (parents and teachers) just decided to get together and write what we wanted for the total community...
>
> We wanted all kinds of programs in but I don't think we were that program oriented. I think we were thinking about process an awful lot through the whole thing. Process has meant a great deal to us all the way through, or it has to me (interview with Ned Winter, 6/4/77).

Winter put the full authority of his role behind the parents and community's right to be involved in the school and to participate in many varied ways ranging from volunteers' helping in ghe lunchroom to ultimate decision making authority in the school via the Neighborhood School Board. The various means for participation in the school are described in Brown (1977). The Neighborhood School Board became a legally incorporated body under Winter's guidance to be able to solicit funds for community development and social services. As will be discussed in the section on governing the school, the NSB was used by Winter primarily as a vehicle for educating the parents and community members in the skills of self-governance and community development.

Winter put the full weight of his personality into developing services to and promoting personal growth in the predominately poor white community. He pressured a university medical facility into giving free medical checkups and booster shots to all of the children in the school. He personally gave money to hire aides and to start a loan fund for community members, establishing the norm of the professionals donating money from their salaries (virtual tithing) to pay parents and community volunteers. He solicited grants which brought in funds for housing renovation, a tool-loan library, a drug abuse prevention program and a mini-bus for community use.

The main concern of the vision seemed to center on parents' and community members' personal growth: how to help poor people to deal with powerful bureaucracies in education, politics, and social agencies, to broaden their horizons of the possibilities in their own lives, and to cope with their often dire personal circumstances. Through training sessions for the NSB, through workshops and T-groups, and through individual counseling, Winter, with the help of the TAG and his right-hand man, Lee Dole, the school counselor, provided experiences over five years, as a result of which many parents and community members have changed their lives. The following quotations reveal some of these changes.

> I talk more; I found sisters and brothers on the board. I feel strong because I feel wanted and needed. I learned to disagree and not get mad. I got to know people and was able to voice my opinion. I know now that I'm not always right and when people vote against me, it was not because I'm colored - they just disagree with me. Staff is more friendly to me now.
>
> I use to be shy and backward - I wouldn't even try to make a decision. Since I've been chairman to the board, things have changed - now I do it and try not to worry about it. Some decisions are bad and that's my fault - others are okay. It (the board) has helped me a lot. Staff is much more friendly to me than ever before.
>
> I have really enjoyed it what times I've been on the board. People seem to treat me different - like I'm more important, you know. I've learned that I'm not always right. I think I'm learning how to get along with people better. I think it is fun.
>
> It (NSB) has meant a lot to me personally. I've enjoyed the workshops and hope we have more. I can explain things to my husband now; we talk things over and can communicate better. It was a turning point in my life (Brown, 1977).

The process was apparently quite arduous with crises in the school and in individuals' lives. Not all parents showed marked growth. One board member talks about that issue:

> I would like to know why some parents grow so much and some parents don't. It's like people have been on the board as long as I have been on the board and I know I've grown. And I'm proud of the fact that I've grown and I'm proud of the fact of how much I've learned. But some parents are still where they were five years ago.... I've lost a lot of friends because of this, because of they way I have grown and the way they have stayed where they are. And they have been through the same thing I've been through. They've been through the workshops. They've been through all the training I've been through.

> I can't understand why they are still where they were when some of us have moved up (Interview with Phyllis Hamilton, parent, 4/6/77).

Winter is convinced of some of the elements of the experience which were essential to these people: interpersonal trusting, allowing people to make mistakes for learning, encouraging and praising the successes of people, integrating the social aspects with the educational, and recognizing the role of sexuality in the dynamics of people's lives. The community school became under his leadership the center of a Rogerian therapeutic community for many parents. In addition to the support and nurturance of learning new skills and confidence, there was a venturing out to new cities to present their experience to academia a heady experience for some who had never left the Fishtown section of River City. The communal spirit which pervaded their lives cannot be underestimated in explaining the parent and community members' involvement. Winter has said that if he had just kept the workshops in a business-like training fashion, people would have stopped coming after the second session. The social and personal enjoyment of the post-workshop festivities was an enrichment to their lives. Also, many workshops were held away from River City. Escape from the bleakness of Fishtown was a motivation for participation. Likewise, Winter has stated that his recruiting young attractive males to the school via the Teachers Corps was a great incentive to getting female parents and community members involved in the school. The Washington Community School represents a most unusual experiment in blending community education with humanistic education.

New York - Responsive Education - Chavez and Harrison (8)

For both Chavez and Harrison in the two New York elementary schools there has been a commitment to the philosophy of open education. This vision, in some measure, has guided their belief in parents' right to involvement in their children's education. Harrison (n.d.) clearly articulated, in a published article, what he wanted to accomplish:

> My own experience during (the 1967 strike)...included being head teacher of the First Community Freedon School ...established and run by a group of West Side parents and teachers....
>
> In 1968, as another teachers strike unfolded...I joined with parents and teachers throughout our district in opening and operating all the regular schools...
>
> The significance of our involvement during that period was unmeasurable. We learned that we could work harmoniously in an atmosphere of mutual respect and that that atmosphere was not only nurturing but perhaps basic to a better education for the children. It seemed clear also that in this atmosphere of informality-in the absence of traditional administration and its bureacratic demands - the possibility for change could become a reality. Upon returning to normality,...a newly formed alliance of parents and teachers tried to consolidate what it had learned in the informal, community school setting and press for change....
>
> The school community took a long step towards the autonomy the decentralization implied and established a committee of teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents to select the first community principal in the district. My professed aim, as that principal, was to support the innovations gained after years of struggle, to unite disparate groups that had developed as a result of the strike, and to foster a sense of community which from experience I knew was possible (Harrison, n.d.).

Both principals have fully cooperated with the strong parents' movement of this school district. Both are appointed by the regional community school board with strong parent support. Both have established a wide array of forms for parent participation in the life of the school, often in conjunction with the open education program of Marian Barber.*

Both principals have established and supported various structures within the school to facilitate the involvement of parents. In addition to active Parent Associations, Harrison formed a Board of Directors of the school which consists of parents and teachers, and Chavez has encouraged a proliferation of parent groups. These include Black Parents' Union, Club de Padres, and the more formal Parents' Committee. These structures will be discussed in the following section on governance.

Chavez has had a more complex relationship with parents of his school. A firm believer in parent involvement in open education, he has been characterized as a flamboyant and opinionated principal who has not hesitated to confront (sometimes abrasively) parents with whom he disagrees. To some parents, he has been "impossible to work with", dominating discussions by his overpowering knowledge and ideas. He has been somewhat amused at being censured twice by parent groups. However, he has steadfastly supported parent's rights and worked closely with them educationally and politically as will be discussed in a subsequent section.

New York - East Town High School - Torzewski (9)

The East Town High School was established a a pilot experimental school which would herald a comprehensive educational complex in the Parkville section of New York. While some aspects of political decentralization had been accomplished by communities for elementary and junior high schools, this effort was aimed at community control of education for older youth. The middle class and upper middle class community leaders of Parkville, who fought for and established the experiment, hired Tom Torzewski in the second school year as the business administrator of the school to assist the school's principal.

---

*For full treatment of these specific kinds of participation, see Karunakaran (1977).

He shared their vision for the school to become a complex center of community controlled educational and social services. This vision was expressed in the school "Prospectus" (February 1, 1970) as cited in Paoli (1977).

> The Program of Community Proposals gives major importance to a one stop neighborhood center, providing coordinated delivery of social services to the community. In providing the most important social service - education, and having in every area a strong community orientation as well as built-in communication with all parts of the community, the Center becomes a natural locale for a multi-service program.

To that end Torzewski has been the prime procurer of funding for the school and the community corporation. As business administrator of the school, he has written for East Town High School and NCEI (often with others' help) every proposal for funding since he was hired. Funds in excess of 1.5 million dollars during the last five years were garnered to develop school and community programs like group homes for teenagers and an Early Learning Center.

As will be seen in the section on governing the school, Torzewski was committed to the model of collaborative decision making by the community. However, as the vision for a comprehensive educational complex waned and was not to be constructed in the middle class community of Parkville, the more socially affluent and politically sophisticated Black, Puerto Rican and white community members ceased active participation in both the school and the community corporation. The school came to be serving mostly poor Black and Puerto Rican families of the East Town section of the community. This new constituency was less willing to sit through ponderous discussions and lengthy meetings often held only in English. The disparity between founders and ultimate clients can most graphically be seen in the inability of the Puerto Rican director of the community corporation to translate to the Hispanic parents of the audience the proceedings of a critical meeting. Despite their common ethnic heritage, he did not speak Spanish well enough to translate to a group different in social class and educational background from himself.

Torzewski had little success in substantively involving these poorer parents in the life of the school. New forms of participation were not tried as a few of the founding community leaders clung tenaciously to the model of collaboration which dictated decision making as the primary avenue of parent involvement. Yet no systematic way of integrating poorer parents into even this process was attempted.

Crises Concerning Securing Support for the School

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

The major crises that struck Washington School occured after the merger of city and county school systems. The former county members dominated the central administration with no former city members holding positions of any significant power. Vestiges of community control in the city were apparently anathema to the county administrators. An initial movement aginst this concept came in a pronouncement abolishing all Neighborhood School Boards (or mini-boards) for city schools (about fifteen were formed) declaring that parents could only be represented by Parent Teachers Associations. Winter had anticipated such a move and had worked with parents and lawyers to legally incorporate their Neighborhood School Board. Formal legal status also would allow independent solicitation of funds. While he decreed that he would continue to delegate all authority of his office to the board regardless of the central administration's pronouncement, he initiated political action to counteract the administration. He sparked parents and teachers to contact every public official possible to pressure the administration into reversal. He and his "community" reached state legislators who were particularilly influential in forcing the administration to change its position and allow multiple parent groups.

The main campaign against Washington School by the central administration came in the form of repeated attempts to close the school and transfer students, teachers, and principals elsewhere. A full account of the major example of this and countermeasures taken can be found in the case study of Brown (1977) previously cited. Public statements to the effect of need for consolidation of schools because of declining enrollments of old facilities as well as fire hazards were given. The public furor that erupted in support of the school in River City expressed a consensus that Washington School was seen by the administration to be too much of a vanguard in community control to be tolerated.

For nearly a year which spanned two academic years Ned Winter worked with parents, community members, and teachers to fight these closing attempts. Several major tactics were employed. First, Ned Winter clearly organized the political activity of parents. He helped them plan strategies, analyze events, and directed actions. Under his orchestration they used the now familiar tactics of political pressure via contacting key public figures to win them over to their side of the fight. In conjunction with this tactic (and in order to reach certain key figures, such as the Mayor), Winter courted several people in the media. Inspired by belief in the rightness of a small community-oriented school in the city being trampled by the powerful bureaucracy of the county-dominated central administration, the media people gave the Washington Community School story more space in the major newspapers than the story of the merger of the two systems. Similar treatment by television stations undoubtedly contributed to Winter and the school community's getting to present their case to several influential individuals.

In addition to making contacts for political pressure and publicity, Winter coached parents on expressing themselves publicly in letters to officials and newspapers, in public statements, in oral presentations, and in public hearings and meetings. Winter, with Lee Dole, helped parents write and rewrite their own statements. They engaged parents in the practice of speaking "on your feet" to officials via role playing with Winter and teachers taking the parts of unsympathetic administrators.

The seriousness of their action is underscored by the reliance on the law to fight the school district. Winter helped parents engage six lawyers through a legal aid society. Winter met nearly nightly with them brainstorming and planning strategies for injunctions. Their legal maneuvers were far-reaching for they uncovered and later used information about irregularities within the school district.

Although they failed by one vote on the River City-Jackson County School Board to halt the central administration, their combined tactics ultimately won. As the schools were under the jurisdiction of a federal judge because of the merger and desegregation, he ruled in their favor. The tremendous publicity generated and the information uncovered about the school district led the judge to keep Washington School open and to chastise the Superintendant of the school district for "misleading" him.

However, the school district tried again several months later to close Washington because of alleged fire hazards. Similar tactics were used to enlist the support of the mayor and others to denounce the irregular procedures used to inspect the building. Again using the media, Winter, staff and parents got pledges of financial support (including proclaiming to have raised $18,00 from the staff) to make all necessary repairs on the building. Once again the federal judge intervened and allowed the school to stay open so that repairs could be made.

A personal tactic which Winter used in dealing with this crisis might be called "sparring" with the administration. On numerous occasions he has refused to follow school district policies despite chastisement. He has often feigned ignorance of policies and procedures. As mentioned, he continued to delegate authority to the NSB when prohibited. During the school closing fights, he negotiated with the central office on several compromises to the full closing, including offering his resignation to "sweeten the pot." In which case he planned to have the Washington Community School, Inc. hire him as Director of Community Education. Also he filed charges of unethical conduct against the district's Human Relation Department when they arranged for a community member to publicly criticize the school on television.

A final example of sparring might be: after winning the most recent battle over fire hazards, Winter requested special school status from the Jackson County School Board. A committee from the district visited the school, reviewed the proposal which would allow them to operate much more flexibly, but recommended that the Board reject the proposal. Instead of fighting the negative recommendation, Winter asked the committee to present evidence of their review (which he had secretly learned was largely positive) and asked the Board to endorse the committee's report. They voted to do so and Winter and his co-workers now publicly claim to have the endorsement of the school board to continue their school and its programs as in the past.

New York - Responsive Education - Chavez (8)

The major crisis which Chavez and the parents of School A reacted to was the shortened school day in New York. Harrison was not principal of School B through most of this crisis although parents there reacted similarly. Chavez expressed to the faculty his deep sympathy with the parents' position on keeping the school open. This action was interpreted by most to be urging the faculty to stay out of the fight and let the parents dominate the situation.

Chavez cooperated fully with parents' requests allowing them virtually to run the school. He planned a court case with them to take the school district to Federal Court. He accepted parents' restrictions on his activities and allowed them to screen all his communications. He made himself totally inaccessible to the central administration so that he would not be ordered to obey their directions.

Chavez, being no stranger to the use of the courts, worked closely with parents to enact a law suit when School A was declassified a Title I school. A lawyer was engaged and in the subsequent legal proceedings the decision was reversed.

New York - East Town High School - Torzewski (9)

The major crisis that beset East Town High School and Tom Torzewski was symptomatic of a larger problem in the shrinking base of support for the school. The cause of concern was the refusal of the central administration to renew the School Finance Contract which allowed NCEI to allocate school funds as it considered wisest. The school district wanted to force the school to account in the same manner as all the alternative high schools under the Office of High Schools of the central administration.

The real issue appears to have been political. The Office of High Schools had already developed a working relationship with East Town High School, insisting only on dealing with Torzewski as principal. NCEI seemed no longer to have the public support of the school board, which had once been favorable but had become estranged. NCEI itself was functionally impotent with few active community leaders and no constituency-based power from either the community or school parents. The previous school principal, Wilma Jones, had personally antagonized the central administration, hostilely denouncing them to their faces in public meetings.

Torzewski took several tactics to deal with the immediate problem of the School Finance Contract but also to seek longer term solutions to the larger problem of support. In the short run, he used his extensive personal and political contacts among the old Parkville elite and in New York to bring pressure on the school board both to meet with him and to resolve the crisis in their favor. Contacts in the news media publicized their plight Also he and staff encouraged parents and staff to demonstrate at the board of education. The effort proved successful. The school board president was influenced and intervened on their behalf with the administration.

Longer range building of support was undertaken by Torzewski. He has attempted to renew contacts within the central administration starting with former friends and colleagues. He has been extremely conciliatory of key personnel in the Office Management and Budget, Bilingual Education, and Titles I, VII and XXI. Finally a major concern has been within the community. He has been carefully maneuvering the possibilities of revitalizing NCEI or starting a new parent/community group or aligning the school with the regional school district. (Which, though for elementary and junior high schools, could provide a haven for a school solely in that region).

New York - Southend Intermediate School - Plotnikov (2)

Abe Plotnikov had used the mini-school concept to create smaller units within the large new intermediate school only to find within two years a rapidly declining enrollment as the Southend section of the city was systematically devasted by fire and urban renewal. There came to be no immediate community around the school, only a large expanse of rubble. Several wings of the new school were fenced off and left empty or used for storage.

Knowing that the school would be closed if the trend continued, Plotnikov used two basic stragegies to increase school enrollment. As students of feeder schools were not close to his school, he knew parents and students would have to feel the school was worth spending as much as an hour to reach each day. Thus, he instituted a public relations campaign to build the image of the school as good academically, musically, and bilingually. Students with musical talent (which usually meant academic talent) were tracked together in their entire daily roster and the band and chorus became the pride of the school. These groups were sent out to perform concerts in the feeder schools for potential students and parents. The bilingual program of the school was given a high priority to attract and retain Puerto Rican students. A bilingual newsletter was sent to students' parents and potential students' parents.

The second major tactic was his use of contacts on the regional school board. Plotnikov had come to the principalship via a coterie of parents whom he had gathered to support the mini-school project he headed when Southend Intermediate School opened. At his urging three of these successfully ran for positions on the regional school board. To increase enrollment he was allowed by the region to institute a ninth grade in the school. Also, the cachement area was redrawn to add a percentage of each of several feeder schools to Southend.

Federal City - Stanton Junior H.S. - Gross (7)

Alvin Gross experienced a similar decline in enrollment at Stanton Junior High School due to the changing nature of the surrounding community. Urban development has virtually eliminated the middle income housing surrounding the school, replacing it with luxury town houses. The majority of the school's students are bused to Stanton from two other sections of the city. The largest single "community" served is quite far from the school on an Air Force base. The majority of these Service parents send their children to private and parochial schools which compete with Stanton and other public schools for students.

Alvin Gross has used the same basic tactics as Plotnikov to increase Stanton's enrollment: public relations recruitment and district connections. P.T.A. meetings have been held in the distant communities rather than in the school building itself. The Air Force base P.T.A. meetings were designed for parents to bring other parents with young adolescents in the hopes of luring them away from reliance on private schools by counteracting the negative image of Federal City public schools.

In addition, Gross has courted the favor of the regional district staff who are promoting a Competency Based Curriculum (CBC) project. He has worked with the TAG to develop the TAG sponsored Management by Objectives project to serve as basic training for the CBC project. His staff has been through special training so the school can become the vanguard for CBC in the school system. Gross has been working to get Stanton named a pilot demonstration school for CBC to ensure its future.

Federal City - Wood Junior H.S. - Clark (7)

For Jim Clark the negative image of Wood J.H.S. as the worst junior high school in the city was a severe problem in the community. Although he had the full backing of central and regional administrators, "the Superintendent will give you anything when you go into a hot spot!" (statement made at N.Y. Seminar for DTA Principals, 1977), he had to deal with the fact that judges, ministers, and parents all believed that Wood was the worst.

Before the school year began, Clark went to parents, teachers, administrators, and community leaders to determine their perceptions of the problems of the school. While variations existed, the consensus was clear. The school plant had to be made safe and secure with school regulations obeyed by staff and students before any learning could occur. Clark's methods of solving these problems will be discussed in other sections. Here the emphasis is on changing the image of the school in the community.

Besides seeking community input on the nature of problems, Clark has sought to communicate to the community and parents his motivations for actions he believed he must take to solve problems. Such dialogue was fostered through extensive and often heated discussions with parents and with community leaders of the local school board. A degree of mutual respect grew. They came to support his often drastic measures when positive results were shown. He came to respect their power, realizating that sometimes the regional board could apply pressure to his superiors to get things for the school which his working through normal administrative channels might never achieve.

Throughout his discussions Jim Clark has sought to emphasize the positive possibilities of Wood Junior High School and its students. He was continually "on the bandwagon" of students' ability to learn. He even enlisted a disc jockey from a local radio station to praise the virtues of the school.

Problematic Situations Concerning Securing Support for the School

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

Winter in his sparring with the central administration has met with mild reprisals on a nearly daily basis. He claims his school is the last to receive all the normal supplies and allotments from the district. He frequently has problems with what should be routine administrative clearance. For instance, the Title I proposal for the school was rejected because it has been largely produced by the parents of the NSB. Winter and parents knew that the law required parent input and demanded acceptance of the proposal.

In seeking additional funds for the school and community projects, Winter and parents have sometimes encountered the stultifying procedures of bureacracies. Two familiar tactics have been used, reaching people personally and political organizing. The spirit of "we are doing good things and if we could get that person to come down here for a day, we would make him a supporter" (interview with Lee Dole, 6/4/77) pervaded the school.

They have repeatedly solicited an individual's help by bringing the person into the community.

A second tactic was to increase the willingness of people to engage in political activity to obtain resources. Winter encouraged parents to elect representatives to run for the city-wide committee that screened community development proposals. Parents did get representation, wrote a proposal, and then packed the public meetings which reviewed proposals.

New York - Responsive Education - Chavez & Harrison (8)

Both principals have been concerned with inadequate resources to carry out the educational programs at their schools. Both have become active fund raisers seeking regional district funds, city projects, and federal and state grants. The flamboyant style of Chavez has made School A a kind of show case for his projects particularly in open education and the Arts. He has become a very visible figure in the city thereby enticing projects to the school.

New York - East Town H.S. - Torzewski (9)

Since Tom Torzewski came to East Town H.S. as the business administrator, he has been the primary solicitor of outside funding for both East Town H.S. and for NCEI. He has written, often with the help of others, every funding proposal since he came to the school, obtaining extensive grant money from federal, state and local sources as well as private foundations.

New York - Southend Intermediate School - Plotnikov (2)

Plotnikov has dealt with the fiscal problems of his school in New York via active fund raising. Soliciting several state and federal grants, Plotnikov ensured his tight control over funds. Apparently, he had been "burned" once before when the regional board took off more than their fair share (in his estimation) of a grant which he had gotten. Consequently on the NIE grant, he definitely used the collaborating agencies to get what he wanted from them and demanded primary control over discretionary funds.

Federal City - Stanton & Wood J.H.S. - Gross & Clark (7)

Both these principals dealt with the recurring problems of obtaining additional resources through using contacts in the school district. Gross has imported several district supported programs including CBC, mentioned earlier. In addition, he has used the personal friendships that his assistant principal has with people in the regional district to obtain additional resources. For example, it has been noted that he has an "uncanny ability" to get half-days off for teachers to engage in staff development.

Clark has sought special programs from these district and outside agencies. He found after initial requests for program assistance that few people or groups were willing: "Helpers avoid junior highs because of the low rate of success" (DTA Seminar, New York, 1977). In addition, he felt it difficult discriminating among the claims of value of programs that were available. He brought in several programs in areas of reading and mathematics, but exercised caution in over-committing the school. For example, he participated in the region-wide Response to Educational Needs Project but allowed only the parent/community involvement and mathematics components to begin. The project had experienced varied success, so he accepted the required community aspects but allowed the mathematics component only because he knew the coordinator who would be working in his school to be excellent. He refused to accept the reading component until the project had improved its functioning.

New York - Polk and Madison H.S. - Lewis and Brinski (1)

The two principals of these large New York high schools were engaged in basic coping strategies. As Irvin Lewis stated, "I counterpunch. I started with a situation, not an idea." The situations were large schools with gerrymandered catchment areas and student transfers from anywhere in the city. New York high school principals are accountable to a borough superintendent and central administration's Office of High Schools. Lewis felt that, "there is more freedom from supervision in big city high schools than in small towns" (interview, 7/1/76). However, he noted that decisions made at the top of the hierarchy always come down on the principals who must adapt to and cope with them. This essential reactive posture seemed to be shared by all the high school principals in the School Self-Improvement project. There was a basic acceptance of the situational constraints of the position. The major methods for enhancing support for the school came from obtaining personal extras for the school from members of the upper echelon of school administration (e.g., borough superintendents can give discretionary additional teacher allotments).

As will be shown in the section on developing programs, a primary concern of these principals was bringing to the school programs that can succeed. District sponsored programs such as SCECAMP for career education piloted in Dolly Madison High School have been imported.

CHAPTER III: PROBLEMS OF GOVERNING THE SCHOOL

CHAPTER III: PROBLEMS OF GOVERNING THE SCHOOL

Page

A. To what extent were parents and community members involved in governance?....68

B. What were the structures used by the principals for governing the schools?.... 70

C. How did the principals deal with parent's level of sophistication in governance?.... 72

D. How did the principals deal with divergent groups?.... 73

E. Visions concerning governing the school.... 76

F. Problematic situations concerning governing the school.... 82

PROBLEMS OF GOVERNING THE SCHOOL

In this section the capacity for solving problems of governing the school will be seen to be:

> (a) involving divergent groups appropriately in decision making via formal and/or informal structures; if parents and community are involved - it means providing information and (often) specialized training. (b) getting the support of the divergent groups through either balancing or integrating their special interests.

This capacity for problem solving will be illustrated by discussing four questions concerning the principals' involvement of parents, community members, and teachers in various governance structures of the schools. These discussions will draw on the analysis of the problem types and the methods of problem solving used by principals which will be presented subsequently. There was only one crisis seen among the principals; for simplicity it will be combined with the visions of the principal involved, Torzewski.

To What Extent Were Parents and Community Members Involved in Governance?

The general finding in the area of governance of the local school shows principals differentially involved community members, parents, teachers, and school administrators. Principals with visions of parent and community involvement in securing support for the school also involved them in some way in governance. Principals with ties to the school district relied more on combinations of teachers and school administrators which will be discussed in the following section on governance structures.

An important context of the visions of principals who desired community involvement in the school is provided by Gittell (1972). She studied the political decentralization of education via community school boards which exercised power in policy making in areas of personnel, curriculum, and budget. Demonstration districts in New York selected principals which were more community oriented, adopted educational programs which showed an increase in acceptance by parents, and allocated resources reflecting new priorities of community involvement (i.e. paraprofessionls) and of basic skills emphasis. Gittell (1977) asserts that:

> "Democracy requires that citizens be engaged in the policy process directly, not through representatives and not only as voters. ...When people feel they can control what goes on, they are more apt to participate... participation without control over policy is not a test of the concept." (p.8).

It is clear from analyzing the behavior of these four principals with community orientations that only two (Winter and Torzewski) systematically involved the parents and community in making decisions in all three of the areas Gittell cites, personnel, curriculum and budget. NCEI established the East Town High School and initially hired administrators and teachers through the grants and School Finance Contracts. The Executive Committee of NCEI exercised control over hiring. The power to hire teachers waned with the fiscal crisis in New York. Also, initial control over budget and curriculum by the founders passed increasely to professionals when the community leaders ceased active involvement in the school, despite Torzewski's efforts. In River City, Ned Winter gave the N.S.B. full authority for decisions in these areas. The N.S.B. was composed two-thirds of parents and community and one-third of teachers. The larger voting block exercised increasing control in these areas over the five years.

The two Responsive Education principals varied somewhat in their relations with parents and community. The major area of involvement fostered by these two principals was in the area of curriculum. Parents were responsible for bringing open education to these schools and principals continued to support their participation.

It should be noted that the highly active, political parents of School B demonstrated vociferously for the retention of individual teachers at the school before and after Harrison's return to the principalship of the school. Despite massive lay-offs and transfers in the city, their efforts, which included barring newly appointed teachers from entering the school, proved successful. Their teachers were retained.

What Were the Structures Used by the Principals for Governing the Schools?

There was seen to be a use of both formal and informal structures by principals. Formal structures existed for all principals to use in involving others in decision making. Three formal decision making structures substantively involved parents: Winter's NSB, Harrison's Board of Directors and Torzewski's Executive Committee of NCEI. The first two also involved teachers. Parents served on three other structures but decision making was really controlled by principals: Chavez's various parent groups, Plotnikov's School Growth Guide Group (SGGG), and Clark's Task force. The latter two also contained teachers and administrators. Gross convened regular meetings with a rather ineffectual structure of the teachers union, the School Consulting Panel (SCP). Lewis and Brinski both convened regular meetings of their cabinets, composed of department chairpersons and assistant principals. Only the NSB of Winter and the cabinet of Lewis and Brinski were key centers of decision making in the schools. These structures, however, did not minimize the formal power of the principals.

The role of informal structures or groups must be taken into account in examining governance. As mentioned Harrison used extensive parent contact within the school in conjunction with the Board of Directors. Torzewski drew on a kind of "kitchen cabinet" of several veteran staff members in the school and the director of NCEI in decision making. Plotnikov had a cadre of veteran staff members who had been with him as trusted confidants for years with whom he consulted before making decisions. Three principals largely relied on themselves in school governance. Chavez was clearly the pivotal figure among a faculty and various parent groups. Clark only slowly and somewhat grudgingly came to share any decisions with his administrative staff or task force. Gross actively ran the school with a ritual of friendly intimidation of the faculty and administrators.

From an analysis of the divergent groups of parents, community members, teachers, and administrators whom the principals have differentially involved in decision making in school goverance, no clear pattern emerges. Most did seem to share decision making in some form, but only to the extent that they could personally tolerate. The reliance upon informal structures and groups of trusted confidents, particularly among teachers, is noteworthy.

How Did Principals Deal with Parents' Level of Sophistication in Governance?

All of the principals had formal structures upon which parents and community members served except Gross, Lewis, and Brinski. As noted, only Winter, Harrison, and Torzewski had formal structures with substantive decision making roles for parents. In the six schools where they were involved, parents required information in order to make decisions: information about school operations, procedures, functioning; knowledge of educational practice, particularly in curriculum and personnel areas; and understanding of legal and policy issues. Principals can, and did, manipulate or dominate decision making by controlling information (through omission or commission). This finding supports the contention of Gittell (1977). She makes this point: "One of the most significant aspects of the development of a participatory system too often overlooked is the need to make information available and provide technical assistance to community participants" (p.).

The opening of the school to parents by the three elementary principals must be seen as an important step in making information accessible to decision makers. In only these schools did parents have the opportunity for extensive personal interaction with school life and its personnel, and thus have any real means of gathering information independent from the principal's sanction. Observing and interacting in classroom instruction, sharing perceptions and personal feelings with teachers, and informal personal contacts with principals constituted a significant initial set of school information. In the other schools, parents did not have this basic informational experience. For example, even in East Town H.S. parents did not have extensive contact with teachers, a condition which caused great mutual distrust.

In addition to personal knowledge of the school, parents required technical knowledge of educational practice. Dialogue with professionals was the beginning of knowledge acquisition; sharing perceptions, values and beliefs is important. However, professionals easily dominated, perhaps unwittingly, particularly in areas of curriculum and budget. Special experiences or training were needed for parents not to defer to the professionals; this was especially true for poorer parents. The Executive Committee of NCEI did not want complete budget reports, only summaries. The parents in River City questioned their ability or right to assess teachers when given the power to hire, evaluate, and fire professionals.

The level of sophistication in parents must again be noted. Educationally sophisticated parents brought in Marian Barber's project and set the tone for the schools' open education for Chavez and Harrison. Yet Winter's parents placed themselves in the middle (physically at one workshop) between the faculty's so-called humanists and behaviorists, not being sure whay they wanted for their children beyond teachers who "loved kids." Dialogue, workshops, and training sessions were painful experiences which helped to build confidence and competence in these parents.

How Did the Principals Deal with Divergent Groups in Governance?

Numerous metaphors have been offered to depict the role of the principal in relation to various groups in the governance of the school ranging from caudillo to father figure. House (1974) offers the notion of the administrative entrepreneur which may be useful in analyzing the principals. While House notes that the primary motivation of the administrative entrepreneur is career advancement within educational bureaucratic structure, DTA does not provide sufficiently broad chronology to study such upward mobility. Rather, the aspects of entrepreneurism which relate to the processes the leader engages in within his bureaucratic niche, the principalship of his school, is the center of attention.

House sees the entrepreneur as a charismatic leader who creates a social organization through "the orchestration of diverse personal needs." He is able to recognize the personal interest and needs of each individual and to direct them toward group activity. He also states, "Naturally it is helpful if the entrepreneur has available an abundance of resources with which to fill needs." Looking at the behavior of the groups around the entrepreneur, he sees a high degree of solidarity a "sense of mission" whereby "members create, maintain and project a coherent definition of their situation. The entrepreneur himself is only the most visible member of the group" (p.).

At the risk of stretching the metaphor beyond credulity, it would seem that all principals display some forms of such entrepreneurism They have access to the resources to minister to personal needs of staff and community, especially those principals who actively raise funds. Several of the principals have been cited as being particularly insightful at seeing talent in their staff and community and knowing how to "get the best set of people." These principals invoke strong loyalty and sometimes provoke equally strong antagonism. A sense of mission and the social aspects of the organization are noteworthy in several cases.

Two variations in the entrepreneurial theme can be seen in the way principals dealt with the groups in their schools. Some of the principals exhibited behavior of governance which indicated a coalescing or integrating of the divergent groups into a single unit with common purpose. Such unity worked to solidify the principal's personal position as leader. Winter, Harrison, Clark, and Gross, though performing this coalescing in different ways, each were similar in seeking such integration.

The second group of principals exhibited behavior of balancing and diplomacy towards the disparate groups in the school. The needs of different factions were juggled as the principals showed deference to peoples' powers, areas of expertise, and personal jealousies. Manipulation of divergent groups to meet their own ends seemed to occur also. Such balancing has been seen in Plotnikov, Chavez. Torzewski, Lewis and Brinski in various forms.

The capacity for solving problems in the area of school governance has several levels of complexity. Principals varied considerably in what they considered to be their problems. Consequently, they varied widely in the extent to which they shared decision making, with whom they shared it, and in the degree of formality of the sharing. Hence, in the statement of this capacity, the expression of "involving divergent groups appropriately" signifies the differences in value positions of principals as to what would be appropriate. Special methods for problem solving in governance is noted when principals consider community and parental involvement in decision making to be appropriate.

Finally, two different methods of solving problems of governance are noted. These entrepreneurial modes of balancing and integrating merit further investigation to determine what personal or institutional factors contribute to their efficacious use by the principals.

Visions Concerning Governing the School

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

Winter has been particularly concerned with empowering people (parents, community, and teachers) for their own personal growth through ownership of the school. The Neighborhood School Board has been the major vehicle to educate parents and community members to take more control of the school and of their community. The vision included seeing the community school as a microcosm of society or as an extended family. Membership was predicated on the common love of children and each member was to be accepted, trusted, and respected. Individual differences, especially in teaching style, were allowed. Mistakes were viewed as opportunities for learning.

Ned Winter began his principalship at Washington School by building up the NSB. He delegated all decision making power of his office to the eighteen member board, equally constituted of parents, community members and teachers. Each elected member might have received votes from any of the three constituencies so that members did not represent a single constituency but, as Winter expressed, represented the entire school community. Winter has adamantly opposed single constituency or interest group representation by board members. He wanted each member of the board to consider and make decisions for the whole school. He encouraged legal incorporation of the board and trained members in writing by-laws, writing proposals, discussing issues, processing information, auditing budgets, and survey techniques. The school budget was a working document for the members.

The NSB screened and hired teachers and paraprofessionals for several years. The Board even removed several, until desegregation and the merger between River City and Jackson County forced them to accept district appointed teachers. NSB committees made extensive observations of teachers and gave teachers feedback on performance. This practice, though called evaluation was more like growth-producing, supportive feedback in which NSB members (particularly parents) encouraged teachers to continue certain practices while asking why other practices were being done. Such dialogue, rather than judgment, served as bridges between the often timid parents and the often insecure new teachers.

Winter unquestionably has manipulated the NSB. He contended that such manipulation was to promote growth and responsibility in the board members as he viewed the purpose of the NSB to be educational. In an interview he said,

> ....We're (Winter and Dole) probably number one and number two manipulators on that board and somehow or other I don't connect that with being evil or bad or wrong or anything else. I think as long as you are manipulating people in a direction of becoming a responsible citizen or becoming responsible for their own actions, or becoming involved and growing, then I feel proud to be called a manipulator....and I think of all the growth in people that resulted from that manipulation...we have supported and encouraged the growth of some and we have let others kind of grope around for their own growth. I tend to manipulate those the most who give me the most strokes for being manipulated. I honestly believe that you throw out a general psychological invitation to growth and I think some accept it (interview, 4/5/77).

interesting, board members were aware of such maneuvering, as one stated:

> We're pretty aware when (Ned) is trying to manipulate us. We are aware of that and (Lee) too....They can be very manipulative when they want to. But I think most of the members of the Board (mabe not some of the new members); I think most of us.... If I agree with them, I let them have their little game and go along with them. If I don't agree, I don't (interview with Phyllis Hamilton, parent, 4/6/77).

An extreme example of such manipulation was Winter's blatant and consistent undercutting of every attempt of the teacher-dominated Curriculum Committee of the NSB to promote school-wide curricular articulation. He felt it would infringe on the individual rights of teachers and would place more emphasis on scope and sequence of curriculum than on his paramount concern with processes of teaching. Other examples include his convincing NSB members not to protest teacher transfers because it would jeopardize the central administration's sign-off on an imminent proposal. Finally, when two Black women were running for NSB chairperson against each other and a white woman, Winter called the two together and suggested that they count their votes and the votes of the third candidate. When they each realized the white woman had a plurality. To Winter's question of "What are you going to do," one responded that she would put all her support behind the other. The NSB elected its first Black chairperson in a community that was 80% white.

In many ways Winter forstered a community of shared concerns. People referred to the Washington "religion" and the "hum" (after a short story written about the school closing fight entitled, "The Hum That Wouldn't Die"). Even before they united to fight the common enemy of the school district, a sense of communal caring existed, born of a score of personal growth workshops on race relations and interpersonal communications, two separate weekly encounter groups, and the open, personal confrontation and dialogue all promoted by Winter and his vision of a humanistic school community. Through these experiences racial antagonisms cooled; behaviorists and humanists on the teaching staff found the commonality of caring for children; and parents found that teachers they had hired because they were sensitive to their children were not structured disciplinarians, however both groups moved closer to a synthesis.

The sense of community may best be seen in the case of a board member who embezzled a considerable amount of money from the NSB. When discovered and restitution was impossible for the person, the scandal was kept within the confines of the NSB (excepting the bank manager) and the crime was portrayed as a learning experience for all concerned. Dole described this experience:

> It has now been eight months since that happened and to my knowledge that information never leaked out. That person is still respected, still loved and that person is still growing, when that person could have been destroyed that day - literally destroyed. And the whole family as well... We been saying for three years - you're in a situation where you can mess up and be accepted and that was the ultimate test.

New York - Responsive Education - Harrison and Chavez (8)

These two principals had a definite reality of parent involvement in their schools. However, the style of operating with parents was markedly different. Harrisons's vision as cited earlier was to foster a sense of community to unite people after the strike. He worked for consensus and tried to counter the usual top-down authority in the schools. He established a School Board of Directors of parents and teachers to vote on issues of curriculum, programs, and scheduling. Also, the school was totally open to parents (they had their own room) and extensive informal contacts between principal and parents were common. Harrison was open about financial matters with the Board. Teachers were individually given an equitable part of the budget to allocate themselves on curriculum material, etc. Harrison expressed strong beliefs in democratic values and processes in the school for teachers, parents, and children. Parents and teachers felt that he supported them and facilitated their developing autonomy in decision making especially within the open education program.

Chavez as a person and a principal seemed to thrive on controversy and confrontation. While supporting parents' rights to be in the school and be involved in governance, he has dominated many a meeting of parents with superior knowledge of the school and ideas for development. There was a proliferation of parent groups, each with their own agenda with which he dealt to give legalistic clearance for their proposals. His interaction with them was more formal than was Harrison's with his parents.

New York - East Town H.S. - Torzewski (9)

The vision and the crisis in governance of East Town H.S. must be seen together. NCEI established East Town H.S. as an experiment to test an "approach to collaborative policy making." Committees and task forces were established by a small group of teachers and founding community members to govern the school as described by Paoli (1977). Torzewski has honored the original labyrinth of the collaborative structure, advising people as to which of the committees a particular request or complaint ought to go and seeking guidance and/or approval from Executive Committee for his actions. Yet in times of expediency and crisis he often had to act alone. Emergency sessions of the twenty-nine member board would turn out the same faithful three or four members each time. Teachers found it hard to respect a non-participating community body who occassionally raged, misinformed on school events.

Torzewski came to use a kind of "kitchen cabinet" on governance of internal school affairs consisting of a teacher and counselor who were two of the original staff. They were made acting assistant principals. To this group was frequently added the input of the director of the adult education component of the school and the director of NCEI. Torzewski sought their advice and relied heavily on these four in decision making.

The virtual collapse of NCEI was precipitated by the non-participation of community and parents in the collaborative decision making structure. A reinforcing cycle of a few key supporters filling a leadership vacuum around Torzewski perpetuated the lack of interest of other capable people in becoming involved. Even those who wanted to become more involved found it easier to let the professionals handle the areas of curriculum and budget. The following quote (Paoli, 1977) indicates the attitude held by a majority of the Executive Committee.

> We got professionals to handle certain kinds of affairs for us. We have to learn how to delegate responsibilities. I trust those people. I don't want to know how much was spent in detail. I'm content with generalities.

The crisis continued with the director of NCEI finally resigning. He felt that he could not carry the organization alone anymore. NCEI lost nearly all of its projects through lack of renewal of funding or default.

Problematic Situations Concerning Governing the School

New York - Southend I.S. - Plotnikov (2)

Abraham Plotnikov felt a great need for stability in the school in the fiscal crisis of New York and the decay of Southend's community. He perceived himself to be a source of stability for the school. Through the NIE grant the school established a School Growth Guide Group (SGGG) * to involve parents and teachers in school policy and decision making. Yet after two years of operation there were definite problems in the SGGG. Plotnikov said of the SGGG, "I don't know what we mean to each other." The SGGG was not a functional mechanism for school governance.

Plotnikov took an active and authoritative role with the SGGG. He had and influenced every decision reached, often manipulating others to make his recommendations. The members came to feel "like a rubber stamp." The structure became a conduit for grant funds, authorizing mini-projects and proposals. Yet, Plotnikov judged all proposals personally by twelve stated criteria. Furthermore, he personally submitted six of the twenty-three funded proposals, accounting for thirty percent of the funds. Only his favored projects in the school were funded. He believed that his judgement was best for the whole school. Rivera and Montesano (1977) quote him in the case study as saying, "I still have the last word because I am responsible. You people are not trying to understand what is entailed in making a decision" (p.25).

Yet to many teachers in the school Plotnikov was a charismatic leader. He was said to run a "benign autocracy" and to be "seductive and intelligent, powerful, democratic and benevolent....(Abe) feels he knows everything

---

* Rivera and Montesano (1977) describe the founding and functioning of the SGGG.

that is going on in the school"(   ). His main support came from a small cadre of teachers with whom he worked in the previous school. He consulted with them on many school decisions. One of these was the United Federation of Teachers chapter chairman who said that Plotnikov followed his advice about 90% of the time. Plotnikov rewarded these faithful teachers with released time, extra duties and compensation, and with positions (e.g., acting assistant principals, deans, Learning Center and Resource Center Directors, and a ninth grade placement position).

Federal City - Wood J.H.S. - Clark (7)

Jim Clark felt that his major initial problem in governance was to get the loyalty of the staff and administrators of the school so they would work together under him. Shared decision making was not an issue; cooperation with authority was. To this end he "appealed to the affective domain", exhorting a spirit of togetherness in a common fight to improve the school. He felt the staff development sessions and social gatherings with faculty were effective in welding a common positive feeling.

He later came to be concerned with receiving and being sensitive to input from others but retained his authority as sole decision maker. The TAG director worked with him to develop communication skills and managerial techniques to obtain support for his policies. He instituted, with the help of the TAG, a task force consisting of members from the elected constituency organizations in the large school: The local school board, the steering committee of department chairpersons, and the School Consulting Panel (teacher's union). He used the structure to get divergent opinions expressed openly for possible resolution and to give him input for decision making. A step towards sharing of decision making was made when he agreed to share the chairmanship jointly with a teacher in the past year.

Federal City - Stanton J.H.S. - Gross (7)

Gross was concerned with getting the thirty faculty members of the school to work for him. He felt that while they might agree with his proposals, they were not committed to them. A particular problem concerned the use of MBO in the classroom. Gross thought he "had their commitment" but found he had only their "agreement." In this relatively small school, which he referred to as the Stanton Family, Gross tried to work towards consensus and usually received a nodding of heads. He met regularly with the SCP representatives prior to faculty meetings to get their input and screen issues not pertinent to the entire faculty. The SCP agreed that this is a wise procedure.

Yet the formal structures of SCP and faculty meeting did not hold the action of Stanton. Structures and roles seemed designed to give maximum leeway to the unwritten roles of interaction between Gross and his staff and two assistant principals. Stanton was run by the dynamism of a ritual of friendly intimidation. Gross made every decision and was involved in every aspect of the school, deriding staff and administrators for not performing their duties and carrying out his orders. His presence was pervasive. Yet his derision and harrassment of teachers, "I've got to ride them all the time" (Interview, 4/12/77), was largely a game with rules clearly known to participants.

New York - Polk and Madison High Schools - Lewis and Brinski (1)

The problems of these two principals in the area of governance arose from a combination of the financial crisis in New York and the nature of the School-Self Improvement Project funded by the NIE grant. An adversarial relationship existed to some degree between department chairpersons serving on the schools' cabinets. The competition for resources among departments became acute during the financial crisis. The addition of the of the role of renewal coordinator because of the School Self-Improvement Project brought an extra person into school decision making. The grant provided in resources in the form of teacher released time and money for project development. The grant also brought in the pressure for collaborative planning and organization development for the school. Although different TAG members saw these concepts in idiosyncratic ways, a common thread of shared decision making was a concept which some of the project's eight principals resisted. Davis (1977) describes the School Self-Improvement Project and these issues.

The viability of organization development was repeatedly questioned by the eight principals. Many doubted its practical expediency when they were under pressure, feeling it might be useful for long range planning. Some felt it was manipulative, giving only the illusion of real decision making. "How could you impart ownership of a large school?" they questioned. "When the principal is not part of shared decision making above him in the hierarchy why should he foster such sharing in his school?" Others stated that organization development was not realistic because it did not deal with the power relationships, (e.g., in the cabinet) that they dealt with daily.

Lewis and Brinski were studied because they had more apparent faith in the processes of the project and had moved farther along in development. Lewis clearly valued getting input from others outside of the cabinet. "I think you'll be losing something if you put (collaborative planning) into existing structures (cabinet). Collaborative planning committees brought me closer to those people I've never had an opportunity to listen to before" (FDF, 10/30/75). And later he stated, "the hierarchy arrangement is difficult to overcome. People don't want to tell you. Hitler had the same problem" (FDF, 11/20/75).

Both these principals worked hard to legitimitze the School Self-Improvement Project and the coordinator's role in their schools, with the cabinets, and with the teachers' union. They supported project activities by politically maneuvering them through the cabinet, defusing objections and accentuating virtues, and lobbying with department chairpersons for support.

Principals selected the coordinators carefully from the staff and worked closely with them. Lewis allowed the Improvement Committee, chaired by the coordinator to make fund allocations. Brinski, however, decided on allocations with the coordinator. Proposals usually then went to the cabinets and sometimes to the faculties for approval.

Throughout the processes of School Self-Improvement Project, the principals exercised great diplomacy. They tried to involve different constituencies, building patterns where people could talk to one another and express ideas. They shared information, but not always too early. They provided legal parameters for proposals. They encouraged teachers to use department chairpersons' expertise and to respect their areas.

CHAPTER IV: PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPING CURRICULUM AND STAFF IN THE SCHOOL

CHAPTER IV: PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPING CURRICULUM AND STAFF IN THE SCHOOL

Page

A. What were the rationals of the principals in development?.......... 89

B. What were the principals' roles in developing curriculum and staff? 90

C. Visions concerning developing curriculum and staff in the school... 93

D. Problematic situations concerning developing curriculum and ,staff in the school.. 98

PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPING CURRICULUM AND STAFF IN THE SCHOOL

As previously stated the capacity for solving problems of developing curriculum and staff in the school would be:

> leading the school in development according to a personally known and held rationale (philosophical or practical) or delegating responsibility and authority for development to one who can lead in that manner.

This capacity for problem solving will be illustrated by examining two issues, the basic rationale of the principal for development and the personal contribution of principals to the developmental processes. These issues will tie together the problems and methods of problem solving which will follow in the sections on visions and problematic situations; no crises were seen.

What Were the Rationales of the Principals in Development?

A basic difference can be seen between principals in analyzing the problems concerning developing curriculum and staff. Six principals had visions which were based on a single basic philosophical rationale for the school in curriculum and/or teaching. The other three were concerned with instituting varied curricular programs which could be considered a practical rationale. For the two elementary principals in New York, Chavez and Harrison, the philosophy of open education guided their vision for developing both curriculum and staff. For Gross, the CBC and MBO projects previously mentioned were a vision but did not have as broad a philosophical base as the other visions did. For Winter, Plotnikov, and Torzewski particular philosophies of teaching processes guided their visions for the staff (but not for curriculum). This is not meant to imply that these six principals coerced all staff to teach or to develop curriculum solely in accordance with the particular philosophy held by the principal. However, it can be clearly seen that these principals, while acknowledging the validity and sanctioning the practice of other approaches, did foster a single preferred philosophy for the whole school.

In contrast are the two high school principals, Lewis and Brinski, and the junior high school principal, Clark. These three headed the largest schools of the study. They were concerned with student bodies diverse in interests and with enormous variability in level of skills. Each seemed to express a position that most of these students were capable of learning but needed a wide range of curricular options to engage them.

Perhaps it is a simple point that could be made here. Large secondary schools have marked heterogeneity from ages and size of the population served. By virtue of the sheer numbers of students great variations in interests and circumstances exist. The older ages of students in secondary schools permits a wide range of ability (e.g., from non-reader to college level reader). These principals felt that a single curricular or instructional approach based on philosophy could not address such diverse needs. They sought special curricular programs that could succeed with groups or types of students. While some educators would argue against the merit of a single philosophically based approach for an entire school, such would seem less appropriate for a large high school than for a small elementary school.

What Were the Principals' Roles in Developing Curriculum and Staff?

Two basic modes of operating were seen in principals which corresponded to the dichotomy in the previous section. The six principals with visions concerning curriculum or teaching were actively involved in clarifying and articulating the vision. They acted as spokespersons to the public, particularly the community, in explaining and defending the philosophy and the practice. They acted as true believers within the school in continuing the development of practice, in actualizing the vision, and in guiding the practices away from deviations from the philosophy.

The three principals of large secondary schools served a related, but different, function. They articulated the purposes of each of the various curricular programs to those outside and inside the school. But they also were active in clarifying the specific client group to be served by any proposed curricular program. This "targeting" of new curricula sometimes required proponents to justify the program's content to the principal's satisfaction.

Of the six principals with visions for curriculum or teaching, Gross and Torzewski were less personally involved in actualizing the visions in the school than were the other four. This development was entrusted to others. While delegation by the principal will be discussed in the section of administering the school, it is mentioned here because in an important respect Gross and Torzewski were much more like Clark, Lewis, and Brinski than the other four principals in regard to personal, daily development of staff and curriculum. These secondary principals saw themselves as primarily administrators not as educators.

Vidich and McReynolds (1969, 1971) in an extensive interview and seminar study of New York high school principals stated that the principal is mainly "responsible for providing an organizational setting adequate for classroom teaching." They quote one principal expressing the distinction between educator and administrator.

> What is most important from where I sit in the principal's office is that the entire philosophy of the high school principal is changing. It's very different from what it used to be. At one time we considered ourselves educators.
>
> I think the problem is much too complicated, the organization is much too vast, the ramifications are too great, the partners in the enterprise are too many for us any longer to serve as educators. It seems to me that the changing role of the high school principal is to move from educator to administrator, and I think this is what is happening in the high school picture. With 4800 children in my school and 245 teachers, with 50 to 60 new ones coming in each year, with a mass input of community decision and policy making, with the selection of staff, with the multiplicty of building improvement, of purchasing and so on, the high school principal doesn't have much time left for the educational process (p).

The three principals of the large secondary schools, Clark, Lewis and Brinski may have been in the situation described in the Vidich and McReynolds study. Perhaps at some earlier time in their careers as administrators they were closely involved with teachers in the educational processes. Perhaps even during the period covered by this study they would have liked to, however, they were not. Torzewski and Gross were in relatively small secondary schools yet they did not actively participate in educational processes either. This was largely by choice.

All of the principals in the study had rationales for developing either curriculumor teaching or both; such rationales provide the basis for the problem solving actions in development. The manner in which the principals led the school in development varied according to the nature of the rationale: a philosophical rationale seemed to engender clarifying the practices relative to the philosophy whereas a practical rationale seemed to necessitate targeting curricula for specific client groups. Some principals solved problems in this area by relying on key staff members to perform the function of leadership in development.

Visions Concerning Developing Curriculum and Staff

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

Ned Winter's vision for Washington School expanded from that of an elementary school to a community school based on the major philosophy of humanism as derived from his Rogerian background. For Winter, the process of teaching was much more important than the structure of the curriculum. Winter's conception of the teacher's role was derived largely from Carl Roger's notions of teacher as facilitator of learning. As Winter, et al. (n.d.) state it: "The traditional role of the teacher as an authoritative manipulator of students' learning is to be replaced by a new role definition of the teacher as a helping or facilitating person" (Winter, et al., n.d.).

It is important to bear in mind the historical roots of this vision. Winter headed an organizational development department in River City prior to the merger with Jackson County in which system-wide change along such humanistic lines was promoted by the Superintendent. As part of the central staff, Winter conducted a massive campaign of teacher growth workshops in techniques of humanistic education for teachers. A significant part of the city plan for change also discussed in the above mentioned article (written by Winter, the Superintendent, and two other members of the central staff) was the role of the principal.

> Rather than the traditional school principal,...(teaching teams) will be coordinated by a Principal Learning Facilitator who will be concerned exclusively with instruction and spend at least one-third of his time in direct contact with students. The administrative paperwork normally handled by the principal will be turned over to a School Business Manager...The school leader is therefore an instructional leader, sometimes called a master teacher, who is more skilled in group dynamics and curriculum than in administrative clerical work.

The principal's role was to be key in the

> laboratory training of the teams in each school...designed to help them learn the group process skills necessary to function with openness and honesty. Individual anxieties, jealousies, misunderstandings, informational questions, and invitations are expected to be resolved as they arise.

Three years after he wrote this article Ned Winter followed this approach in many ways in his role of principal. He did extensive group process training with the staff. He involved himself much more in interaction with staff and students than in administrative work of any kind. He instituted the NSB evaluation for growth with the staff on promises such as he and Dole (n.d.) expressed in the following:

> We would rather have a person on our staff who loves kids, can relate with them, trust them, fails and grows with them, than a person who is weak in these areas but possesses only skills in implementing academic programs. It's not that we accept weakness in teaching cognitive skills; we feel it is easier to help a teacher acquire these skills than to teach him to work in the interpersonal area.

A primary means of actualizing the vision has been Winter's encouraging teacher autonomy and challenging their creativity for the sake of their personal and professional growth. Teachers were given virtually total freedom in the area of curriculum (selecting contents, teaming or collaborating with others, and in scheduling activities). Teachers frequently changed grade levels, teams and roles (e.g. teacher to community ed. staffer) from year to year. In addition Winter defended the rights of some of the staff to teach in a more formal, traditional manner in structured, self-contained classrooms.

Perhaps a key to Winter's performance of his role is in the earlier quote which called for a principal to be a master teacher skilled in group dynamics and curriculum. Winter was a master teacher only in tbe sense of a group process facilitator. He was conspicuously unconcerned about and unknowledgeable of curriculum. There were repeated demands from the staff for him to provide clarity and cohesion in the area of curriculum. However, Winter, the counselor, was predisposed to value processes of human interaction and to see curriculum only as a static map of scope and sequence.

New York - Responsive Education - Chavez and Harrison (8)

Both of these principals were acknowledged as leading practitioners in the open education movement. They have been active in its promotion and have become thoroughly knowledgeable of its philosophical, pedagogical, and historical underpinnings. They have travelled extensively in the United States and England to observe variations in open education practice in conjunction with Marian Barber and other leaders of open education.*

Both principals have created school situations where support for the growth of open education practice existed alongside of more formal or traditional classes. The many administrative arrangements performed by Chavez and Harrison which supported the growth of open education will be discussed in the section on administering the school. Both created environments where the principal could have extensive interaction with children in their learning in the informal atmosphere of open classrooms and corridors. This interaction has permitted them to come to know their clients and the programs of the school in an intimate fashion. In addition, both were extremely active in working with teachers in curriculum and staff development in their own areas of interest and expertise (Chavez in art and Harrison in mathematics). Both relied heavily on the general development work in open education curriculum and teaching of Marian Barber's project.

---

* Karunakaran (1977) provides a full description of open education philosophy and practice in these schools.

A significant function of these two principals' roles was to articulate the philosophy and practice of open education to the public and within their schools. In other schools which tried open education, principals were "facilitating," providing sufficient administrative support for programs to get started. However, parents and teachers felt the programs often floundered, lacking clarity and a sense of priorities in the midst of fiscal crises or attacks from critics in central administration. In confusion, parents and teachers were "willing to forsake open education methods and ideals" (FDF, 11/18/75) without the principal acting as a leader and articulator of the open education philosophy.

Chavez and Harrison provided the clarity of philosophy and practice necessary for action in their schools. They explained to new parents and teachers the nature of the program. They made statements of policy and philosophy which provided guidance to parents and teachers.

New York - East Town H.S.- Torzewski (9)

While some degree of innovative curriculum was present in the developing vision of East Town H.S., the major vision centered on the small school's personal and supportive role of the teacher towards the students. Torzewski shared the basic school vision of extreme commitment to the students ability to learn. Teachers must "respect that students can learn, make most strenuous demands, convey high expectations" (DTA Seminar, New York, 1977).

While Torzewski felt that the principal as manager of the school should "model" these attitudes, as a business administrator he empowered one of the original teachers of the school to be an acting assistant principal for instruction. Sylvia Mrozic designed and developed nearly every staff training session at the school as well as the Transition Orientation Workshop for all new students. She has been the prime force in articulating the model of teaching at East Town, a critical function since on three occasions in the New York fiscal crisis, half of the teaching staff was replaced by teachers unfamiliar with (and often antagonistic towards) East Town's special teaching model which required an enormous commitment of time, energy and patience.*

New York - Southend I.S. - Plotnikov (2)

Abe Plotnikov had the vision of the mini-school complex wherein a large school would be divided into smaller self-centered subschools. He saw the people in a subschool as a family with administration and guidance decentralized to each subschool, where teachers and administrators knew all the students by name. This more supportive structural arrangement would promote the vision of creative teachers and viable teaching teams. Plotnikov has seen himself as a master teacher and real leader in creative teaching. He believed that teachers must care about students, respect their ability to learn and through creative and challenging teaching, get kids excited and interested.

Plotnikov actively engaged in behaviors designed to stimulate such teaching in his staff. He believed that he "set the tone for high standards" by randomly collecting notebooks from students as well as lesson plans and tests from teachers, notifying teachers if he wasn't satisfied that they had challenged students. He has publicly demonstrated his support and respect for teachers who want to improve their teaching and discuss new ideas, who engage in planning more effective programs, who teach creatively, and who participate in school activities. Such encouragement was seen to project to project an image that inspired people. Similarly, he created leaders for projects by rewarding and supporting certain staff members. A participant in the school described him in the following manner: "He is remarkable. He is very sensitive and smart. He knows how to identify people and get the best out of them" (Rivera and Montesano, 1977).

---

* Paoli, (1977) provides a full description of the teaching and learning processes at East Town High School.

Federal City - Stanton J.H.S. - Gross (7)

Al Gross had a vision of sorts which centered on making Stanton a "School Without Failure." He promoted a ninth grade project to reduce the member of students who failed. The heart of the project was an MBO process which Gross later tried to foster within the instructional planning and teaching of the entire school staff. This became the precursor of the CBC project which Gross imported from the regional district.

It is not clear that Gross held a basic philosophical premise which informed his selection of MBO or CBC. Additionally, he consistently has invested an assistant principal with powers of instructional leadership in the school on matters of any significance.

Problematic Situations Concerning Developing Curriculum and Staff In the School

Federal City - Wood J.H.S. - Clark (7)

From Jim Clark's arrival at Wood J.H.S. he has felt that his primary responsibility was to provide administrative order and building security. He did feel that a good traditional program emphasizing basic skills was required and teachers needed to get away from a model of teaching which sees children as inherently deficient as well as to use more systematic planning for instruction. However, he put his personal emphasis on the situational context of the school building and on importing good curricular programs.

While he solicited programs from outside, he established a committee inside the school to screen potential programs. He felt that most available programs were of dubious value. While resisting the RENP reading component (as mentioned earlier), he brought in consultants to assist in the teaching of reading.

New York - Polk & Madison High Schools - Lewis & Brinski (1)

The major problems of the New York high schools in this area concerned what they called the "new clients," meaning the poor Blacks and Hispanics. The educational programs of the high schools were seen as rooted in a tradition, a history of proven success with the "stable" white middle class student population. The principal believed these programs were not succeeding with the new students and their circumstances.

The high schools served about 3500 students. Of these students at least 10% were non-English speaking; only 35% remained in the school from September to June; some 20% arrived in September for which the school did not plan (e.g. on rosters); and another 10% for whom the school did plan, did not arrive in September. The logistics of planning for the course offerings under these circumstances were difficult. When one included the fact that the median reading level (of English speakers) was 5.2 grade level equivalent, the emphasis principals put on programs that could succeed was understandable.

The principals both felt that they must find or develop curricula which were based on the real nees of the extremely varied population of students. Yet new programs could not cause administrative difficulties for the other school programs (e.g. in terms of scheduling). They did not want a fragmented school but one where new programs were coordinated or interfaced with existing school programs.

The special programs established by Irving Lewis at Polk H.S. illustrate the way in which the principal addressed the problem. He established the following separate programs, each with their own curriculum.

- a half-day remedial program for illiterates
- a bilingual program for Hispanics
- a college bound program for students reading at the high school level
- a program for bright underachievers
- a ninth grade mini-school for students with emotional maturity problems
- a half-day G.E.D. cram course for "over-age (17-20 years) destroyers"

Brinski of Madison H.S. adopted a similar approach to curriculum and programs. She instituted, among others, special programs in values classification, sex education, and career education.

Both principals served an important function in determining the applicability of programs and curricula to student populations, noted especially in the curriculum development fostered under the NIE grant. While intended to develop an organizational capacity for problem solving, grant money went mainly for curriculum development. Yet as these school people viewed problems of the school primarily as curricular in nature, such behavior was not surprising. Principals continually questioned the validity of programs and projects proposed, making proponents justify applicability to specific student populations. When a group wanted to import the IGE model into the ninth grade mini-school, the principal (Lewis) raised serious objections, believing the model to have been developed on and for the same white middle class students who had formerly populated the school. Both principals encouraged needs assessments, and evaluation procedures for programs. Also, they raised questions concerning teachers' new roles in projects as possible conflicts which might ensure. Finally, both had their own ideas for programs which they suggested; they did not demand these programs be developed as their role appeared to be basically that of encouraging, supporting and facilitating others to do this development.

CHAPTER V: PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING THE SCHOOL

CHAPTER V: PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING THE SCHOOL

Page

A. How did principals manage their schools?........................ 104

B. On what basis did principals make administrative arrangements?.. 109

C. Problematic situations concerning administering the school...... 113

PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTERING THE SCHOOL

In an earlier section of this paper the capacity for solving problems of administering the school was stated to be:

> (a) conceiving of the whole school's tasks and delegating to others and selecting for self tasks according to people's talents for an optimal overall balance or fit. (b) making administrative arrangements based on educational programs of curriculum and teaching one is trying to develop, not on administrative expediency.

The two basic aspects of this capacity will be illustrated in two sections discussing the methods which principals used to solve administrative problems in their schools. There were found no visions or crises in the problems in this area. The problematic situations of these principals and their particular methods of solving are presented after the discussion sections.

How Did the Principals Manage Their Schools?

While some might hold the assumption that the role of principal includes basically the same administrative duties across schools, it would appear that both similarities and marked differences among these nine principals occurred. For parsimony, there were three basic modes in which principals engaged in managing the school: educational interaction (with students, with teachers on curriculum, teaching, etc.); in administrative routines (bureaucratic paperwork, teacher evaluation, school announcements, scheduling classes, etc.); or in coordinating managers (assistance principals, deans, supervisors, department chairpersons). All principals spent some in each type of action, however, definite differences in the predominant type or types can be seen. Figure 3 summarizes the activities; an "X" indicates predominant activities for each principal.

FIGURE 3 ACTIVITIES OF THE PRINCIPALS

Principal	Type of School	Educational Interaction	Administrative Routines	Coordinating Managers
Winter	Elementary	X		
Chavez	Elementary	X	X	
Harrison	Elementary	X	X	
Torzewski	Alt. H.S.		X	
Plotnikov	Int. (J.H.)S.	X		X
Clark	J.H.S.		X	X
Gross	J.H.S.		X	
Lewis	High School		X	X
Brinski	High School		X	X

The chart reflects the earlier distinction made concerning the fact that only four of these principals considered themselves primarily educators. However, two of these did considerable administrative work. They acknowledged that their ratings from central administration in large part depended on attending to paperwork and they usually spent evenings on it. Also, as it will be shown in a subsequent chart, the TAG provided expert assistance in staff and curriculum development while the principals performed the obligatory teacher evaluations. Plotnikov skillfully employed assistant principals and deans whom he directed.

The remaining principals who saw themselves primarily as administrators used the other two types of activities. Those with the largest secondary schools relied heavily on their managers, whom they coordinated. The other two, Torzewski and Gross, headed smaller secondary schools which they personally administered.

Figure 4 indicates the specific activities which were either performed by the principals or delegated to others in the school. Such categorization is not intended to be exhaustive of all the activities in which the principals engaged. Rather, it is suggestive of the basic differences in the patterns of delegation of responsibility concerning principals. It also serves to highlight activities which are not a priority for the school (note the blank cells). Hall duty is not a priority area for the elementary school but is for secondary schools - particularly the large high schools. Staff development is not a systematically addressed priority in the traditional secondary schools (except in Plotnikov's school where he established Learning and Resource Centers).

FIGURE 4 DELEGATION OF ACTIVITIES

Principal	Type of School	Business Admin.	Teacher Eval.	Hall Duty	Curr. Devel.	Staff Devel.
Winter	Elementary	Sec. LSB/Tchr.	LSB		Tchr.	Prin.
Chavez	Elementary	Prin.	Prin.		TAG/Prin.	TAG/Prin.
Harrison	Elementary	Prin.	Prin.		TAG/Prin.	TAG/Prin.
Torzewski	Alt. H.S.	Prin.	A.P.	Tchr.	A.P.	A.P.
Plotnikov	Int. (J.H.) S.	A.P.	A.P.	Dean	Tchr./L.C.D.	R.C.D.
Clark	J.H.S.	Prin.	A.P.	A.P.		
Gross	J.H.S.	Prin.	Prin.	Prin./Tchr.	A.P.	
Lewis	High School	Prin.	Sprv.	A.P./Pat.	Dept. Ch./Co.	
Brinski	High School	Prin.	Sprv.	A.P./Pat.	Dept. Ch./Co.	

Abbreviations

Sec.	Secretary	Dept. Ch	Department Chairmen
LSB	Local School Board	Co	Coordinator
Prin	Principal	Pat	Security Patrol
A.P.	Assistant Principal	LCD	Learning Center Director
Tchr	Teachers	RCD	Resource Center Director
Sprv	Supervisor	TAG	Technical Assistance Group

Patterns of delegation may be seen across the principals. Only Winter and Plotnikov delegated business administration virtually entirely. Nearly all delegated the evaluation of teachers. In those schools where hall duty was considered important by the principal, it was delegated by all except Gross who (as in teacher evaluation) felt the need to be highly visible in the school. Brinski has been known occasionally to patrol the halls with a walkie-talkie. Nearly all principals delegated curriculum and staff development activities. Chavez and Harrison worked with staff and TAG advisors in their areas of expertise. Winter ran workshops using consultants and his counselor Lee Dole as facilitator.

The most significant point to the selective delegation which principals did might be to assess the degree to which they were acting on situational constraints (i.e., coordinating managers and delegating virtually everything because of school size); or were choosing to do those things in which they were interested, using delegation to avoid certain activities; or were carefully assessing strengths of individuals in the school in whom to invest responsibility and authority. It would seem that the third alternative might be the one most logically attractive, although the situational and personal pressures of the other two ought not to be underestimated. Each principal praised the capabilities of people to whom he had delegated authority in these areas. As earlier cited, several of these principals (particularly Plotnikov and Harrison) were noted for sensing talent in people and using it. It is clear that managing a school of some 3500 students required a management team and administrative routines. It is also clear that some principals (particularly Winter, Clark and Torzewski) chose to engage in what they personally preferred to do.

On What Basis Did Principals Make Administrative Arrangements?

For seven of the principals there was some degree of effort put forth to make administrative arrangements for the school which were based on knowledge and support of the educational programs. Administrative arrangements were procedures and policies such as scheduling classes, lunch and recess periods; ordering supplies; using space; assigning teachers and students; allocating resources; assigning non-instructional duties; etc. In many public schools such arrangements are products of decisions usually made by principals based on a rationale of administrative convenience and efficiency without careful consideration for the manner in which they constrain educational programs. Several of these principals actively sought to make such arrangements based on the dictates of educational programs of the school; they had a clear priority in mind of how to support and enhance the educational processes by these arrangements. Others were less active in this regard but examples of such behavior were observed. For two others, the priority for administrative order and effectiveness seemed primary.

The three elementary principals, Winter, Chavez and Harrison, were the most active in their desire to facilitate educational programs and processes by administrative arrangements. The responsive education program of Marian Barber had clear guidelines for the kinds of arrangements necessary for the project to progress. Both Chavez and Harrison even went beyond these essentials in creatively determining administrative ways of enhancing program functioning. Winter delegated virtual autonomy to teachers in not only curriculum but administrative arrangements in support of programs, thus allowing teachers to make the decisions they felt were most supportive of their work.

Four other principals, Plotnikov, Torzewski, Lewis and Brinski, tried to a somewhat lesser extent than the elementary principals, to develop administrative arrangements based on programs. Plotnikov delegated some authority to subschools to make their own procedures (e.g., scheduling of teachers and rostering of students). Torzewski did make special adjustments in scheduling and space in the building which would be most appropriate for special curricular projects. Lewis and Brinski performed major services for the curricular projects of the School Self-Improvement Project by adapting the administrative procedures of the school to the needs of the experiments and by incorporating successful experiments into the regular school program. It should be noted that the experimental projects did have to conform to many administrative guidelines (e.g., not conflict with programming requirements of the department nor "fragment" the school). Also, Lewis held a general attitude of being initially positive about new project ideas to proponents. Instead of delineating all the administrative reasons why the idea could not be tried, he used force field analysis to discover ways to implement the idea by unblocking probable administrative impediments. .

The two basis aspects of the capacity for solving problems of administering the school can be seen as a process of wisely using the human resources the school to accomplish the comprehensive set of tasks which must be accomplished to support the educational programs. Both aspects are important. An overconcern with developing an opitimal utilization of human resources for administering may produce a myopia which ignores the purpose of these administrative functions to support educational processes. The relationship between the methods of solving development problems and administrative problems needs to be noted. It is unlikely that a single person such as the principal could perform all the problem solving functions illustrated; principals must utilize the talents of others in the school in these efforts.

Problematic Situations Concerning Administering the School

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

As part of the vision for the principal as a group dynamics leader and not an administrator, it was thought that each principal would have a business manager for the school. Ned Winter preferred to engage in interpersonal processing with students, teachers, and parents. He engaged in two other activities, developing the community education projects and proposals and fighting the school closing attempts of the central administration. For him, the problematic situation was to find other capable people to perform these administrative routines. Concomitantly, he had a belief in empowering people to decide on matters of importance in their lives. Thus, he sought to give responsibility and authority for many of the administrative duties to those who would make the administrative arrangements most responsive to educational process. Also, he tried to make the duties themselves educational processes for those who performed them.

Winter believed that he did not give orders to people, rather that when he had delegated authority and responsibility, he trusted them as adults to carry out the tasks with autonomy and flexibility. His office secretary handled virtually all paperwork and management. When she became overloaded, Winter brought in a bookkeeper to help her and parent volunteers to answer phones and meet visitors. He created a business manager in his secretary. The policies and procedures for running the elementary school were determined and executed by the NSB and its committees and task forces. The chairperson of the NSB was empowered to oversee the performance of these groups. Teachers were responsible for the curriculum, for the use of space, and for their arrangements as individuals or teams. Teachers, students, and parents determined all scheduling and rostering for the school year. Because of extensive interaction among grades, classes, and people in the school, teachers requested students for the subsequent year and students and parents requested certain teachers. Each September sheets of newsprint were posted in the front hallway of the school with teachers' and students' names. A month of experimenting in classes and much switching ensued in which names were changed on the newsprint. After the first month changes could only be made if two of the three parties (teacher, student, parent) desired it.

Winter's role was to help each of these groups of people perform these tasks. Help, to him, meant providing sufficient training to perform competently, personal support to give confidence, and counseling when personal or interpersonal problems occurred. Administrative order, coordination, and efficiency were not particular concerns for him. His attitude was that the growth from people taking responsibility for arrangements which effected them was not necessarily orderly. He also believed that he should not enter to solve administrative problems which others complained about but rather help them process their feelings and allow them to find their own solutions

A parent stated:

> He won't solve your problems for you. If I come in here with a problem, he will say, "What are you going to do about it?" He won't say, "I'll do that about it" He'll say, "What are you going to do about it?"....A lot of times (he'll tell you alternatives) but he'd rather me work through them first. "What are some of your alternatives?" I can say, "this, this, this," and...he'll say, "Or this, this, or this." But he never completely solves the problem for you ( ).

His actions showed that he largely did perform in accordance with his beliefs.

New York - Responsive Education - Chavez and Harrison (8)

As both principals were proponents of open education, they felt that they should try to administratively facilitate its operation in their schools. They sought to break down the large school into smaller, more intimate communities with familiarity and support for children. Also, they felt they should place teacher autonomy and procedures which facilitate programs above administrative expediency. However, they felt they had been given administrative duties of their role which they had to perform: evaluation of teachers, conformity to school regulations, using United Federation of Teachers procedures, allocating budget resources.

Both principals made administrative arrangements which reflected their understanding of the rationale of the open education and the operation of the Responsive Education Project in their schools. They reorganized the organizational charts of the schools to place teachers in proximity who desired to work together. They programmed lunch and preparation periods so that teachers who collaborated in corridors were scheduled together. They only requested substitutes who were personally knowledgeable of the program. They assessed the school building for natural physical places for effective collaboration. They mixed students in terms of age, grade. and background for heterogeneity. They coordinated school-wide plans to support individual variations among corridors. Harrison, in addition, redesigned the role of the cluster teachers. Whereas they were formerly specialists in art, music, science, etc. seeing fifteen or twenty classes within the building, he assigned them each to specific teams of four or five classes as full members who could get to know and work with students and teachers. He also used cluster teacher meetings as communication links between corridor teams. While both principals gave teachers the power and responsibility for the curriculum and the use of their time, Harrison also equitably divided the money available in the budget for books and materials among the teachers so they might individually or as teams, purchase those which they deemed necessary.

As the assistors of the Responsive Education Project were engaged in staff development with these principals playing a minor part, Chavez and Harrison carried out a major duty of the role, evaluating teachers. Harrison commented about this duty in an interview:

> It's a structural obligation; the principals have to do it.. But evaluation, I think it has to be seen in the larger sense...in relation to staff development...within the guidelines for rating, it is very clear that the principal doesn't have a case for grades of unsatisfactory, for example, unless he or she can show, document, how he has tried to support the teacher...So with that point of view, the advisor can actually play a role for the principal without alienating teachers. ...the role of the assistor would be jeopardized if he or she was perceived as a rated official or an extension of the principal.... (But) I feel in the assistors' service in a certain way is an extension of myself; it's that part of my position that wants to help people and to help them grow professionally, and in that view, I'll do whatever possible to support them.

While Chavez and Harrison have the same general attitude towards the role of advisor in staff development, Chavez would have preferred the assistors to be more helpful to him in alerting him to difficulties teachers were having. He believed that advisors ought to be part of the principal's team, able to see whole school issues.

New York - East Town H.S. - Torzewski (9)

Torzewski was originally hired as the business administrator of East Town H.S. to support the Director, Wilma Jones, who acted as the educational leader. After assuming the principalship without a strong background in teaching (only a year of teaching night school), Torzewski appointed Sylvia Mrozic acting assisting principal for instruction. He maintained all administrative routines of the school. To her was delegated to all responsibility for staff development and curriculum development as well as evaluation of teachers. However, the legitimate authority still remained in the role of principal. Mrozic's stature in the school allowed the informal authority of her role to suffice until the rapid and extensive turnover of teachers produced a situation wherein half the staff were staunch UFT supporters. These teachers demanded adherence to the UFT contract which preluded much of the extraordinary time, energy, and commitment of the East Town model. Then the formal lines of authority had to be invoked in the person of Torzewski.

New York - Southend IS. - Plotnikov (2)

For Plotnikov, junior high schools presented definite administrative problems by their size alone. New, younger students tended to get lost in the large building. Administrators and guidance personnel did not really know students. In addition, his school each year saw a fifty percent turnover in students.

Plotnikov's major vehicle for addressing these problems was administrative decentralization into subschools. Each subschool had its own separate space or wing of the school with self-contained administrators and guidance personnel. Student movement was limited to the wing of the subschool for the most part. Teachers were arranged on teams in the subschools and were given autonomy to modify curriculum to adapt creatively to student turnover.

As mentioned in the previous section, Plotnikov considered himself a master teacher and instructional leader. Thus, administrative decentralization combined with reliance on a trusted assistant principal allowed him to be more visibly involved with teachers and only to coordinate the managerial team of assistant principals, project directors, and deans.

Federal City - Wood J.H.S. - Clark (7)

For Clark, two related administrative problems existed. The first was how to get loyality from his administrators, so they would not undercut his authority, and from his staff so they would carry out his policies. The second was how to effectively manage a large organization while retaining time to think and plan.

Clark has used the technical assistance group to help him build what he considered to be a management team, one which understood the rationale for his policies and would faithfully execute his procedures. To this group he gradually entrusted more authority, so that he delegated most daily administrative duties such as hall patrol, student discipline, and teacher evaluation. Such delegation has freed Clark to "prioritize my time and to think things through." With the help of the TAG director, Clark has used force field analysis flow charts, action planning, and brainstorming on himself and his own personal strategies for enacting change in the school.

Federal City - Stanton J.H.S. - Gross (7)

Alvin Gross considered himself an administrator. He believed his staff exhibited avoidance behavior in their jobs (e.g., teachers wouldn't hand in forms or go out on hall duty and one of the two assistant principals was "shiftless and lazy"). He believed that the principal needed to "really ride" and "intimidate" these people to be responsible, that the principal must be out in the halls and in the classrooms "visible, an energizer, a symbol." Apparently, the only one in the school whom he largely trusted as fully competent was an assistant principal to whom he delegated full authority in instructional matters.

Gross behaved in a manner consistent with his beliefs. He performed nearly every administrative task personally - continually patrolling the halls, supervising assemblies, making even the most routine of announcements on the public address system. He seemed to the TAG director reactive to whatever "gnawed" at him at the moment, and thus quite unsystematic in addressing problems. However, he managed to get tasks done.

He performed a kind of ritual with the staff whereby he would harass them for not performing some responsibility and they would minimally comply only to try to avoid the duty on the next occasion. Teachers simply refrained from going into the halls to patrol on their scheduled periods until he came by to check on them. A rowdy crowd of students in an assembly conducted by Gross misbehaved in full view of their teachers until Gross announced that teachers would have to take classes of misbehaving students back to their rooms. The statement successfully provoked the teachers to control the offending students. Gross knew the teachers did not want to return to the classroom. It seemed as if Gross was enacting a ritual between principal and teachers which parodied the game of coercive discipline played daily by teachers and students.

New York - Polk and Madison High Schools - Lewis & Brinski (1)

For the principals of the School Self-Improvement Project, two problems seemed to occur. The first was how to continue to support the successful improvement projects within the school. The second was how to maintain and improve troublesome administrative procedures. Of particular difficulty were: scheduling programs, providing feedback, massive standardized testing, the distribution of bus passes, and rating the probationers among the teachers.

In dealing with the first problem both principals were particularly desirous of continuing successful projects they had found. They reallocated resources to retain them. They worked with department chairpersons to find building facilities and materials. They used released time allotments to support teachers in planning and teaching. Most importantly, they integrated successful projects which were developed under the grant into the regular curriculum through the approval of the school budget to support them.

In the second problem area of administrative procedures, both principals "influenced middle management" (in the words of Lewis). A large administrative staff which the principal coordinated performed all the routine, yet complex, tasks of scheduling, distribution, supervision, evaluation, student discipline, etc. Lewis noted that he would not "go one-to-one with a teacher; that would vitiate the supervisor's role." The hierachical chain of command was critical. The Improvement Coordinator performed the valuable delegated function of developing programs that the principal wanted. To support this development effort, principals relieved coordinators of other administrative duties. The principals, to quote Lewis, "worked through others"; having "indirect routines, objectively administered." He would "do nothing in some situations" to buy time for cooling-off of emotions or to allow others to "intervene and mollify in crises."

Despite the hierarchical administrative structure created in these schools to deal with 3500 students and 150 teachers, both felt the principal should act as a stimulator for positive change. They sought to encourage this positive change by saying yes to new ideas and then trying to work them out operationally (rather than stifling them with a "no" answer). Lewis felt that "the school pulsates....you can make weather, make people's lives easier." One way to do this, he said, was by "tapping token funds to unblock the feeling that nothing can be done."

CHAPTER VI: PROBLEMS OF MEDIATING HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE SCHOOL

CHAPTER VI: PROBLEMS OF MEDIATION & HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE SCHOOL

Page

A. How did the principals deal with student behavior?................ 122

B. How did the principals try to enhance teacher morale?............. 124

C. Visions concerning mediating human relations in the school........ 125

D. Crises concerning mediating human relations in the school.........127

E. Problematic situations concerning mediating human relations in the school...128

PROBLEMS OF MEDIATING HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE SCHOOL

The previously stated capacity for solving problems of mediating human relations in the school would be:

> establishing and enforcing a system of preventative and punitive student behavior policies based on a personally known and held rationale (philosophical or practical).

This statement of a capacity is quite incomplete as it focuses only on students. As mentioned earlier, data in this problem area are the weakest of the five areas. The projects of the technical assistance groups studied by DTA did not invest much energy in this problem area, consequently it was documented the least by DTA.

Human relations in the school concerned the interpersonal relations among administrators, staff, and students. The problems perceived by principals showed two major areas to be of concern: student behavior and staff morale. The statement of capacity addresses only the former as evidence of increasingly successful problem solving in this area was observed. However, none of these principals exhibited successful solving of problems of teacher morale. One is left without a clear and comprehensive sense of what a capacity for solving problems of mediating human relations might be.

How Did the Principals Deal with Student Behavior?

In general, one can see a significant difference in the enforcing of student discipline between the elementary schools and the secondary schools. The more personal and individualistic enforcing of discipline by an involved principal was found in elementary schools which had visions of supportive learning environments for young children. The more impersonal and general enforcing of discipline by an authority delegated by the principals was found in secondary schools larger in size of building and student population and with older students. The smaller secondary schools present somewhat of a middle ground especially in the case of East Town High School which had a vision of a more personalized learning environment but in recent months encountered serious problems of student discipline.

Dreeben (1967) suggests that the moving from the more personal procedure of the secondary school may serve an important function in students learning norms of specificity and universalism "to acknowledge the right of others to treat them as members of categories often based on a few discrete characteristics rather than on the full constellation of them representing the whole person" (p.). He contends that although the categorization employed in schooling is frequently deplored as impersonal and dehumanizing it must be recognized as being connected to the ideas of fairness and equity (especially when contrasted to incompetence, favoritism and arbitrariness). Similarly only characterstics of relevance to matters or activities of people ought to be considered in decisions. Dreeben sees high schools as being a better place to learn these principles because of tracking of students with similar capacity, varying teachers, and a wide range of activities.

Leaving aside for this study any axiological discussion of the norms Dreeben describes, the data from these schools indicate that the elementary schools made an effort to be more personal as in families, to see students as "whole people" in contrast to the procedures of larger secondary schools which, as Lewis stated earlier, relied on "impersonal routines, objectively administered."

In each of the schools which addressed problems of student behavior with increasing success there existed a basic rationale either philosophical or practical which the principal espoused. The rationale seemed to incorporate both preventative and punitive aspects as it expressed the basic norms of human relations for the school in a positive sense as well as made explicit the processes that would ensue upon transgressions.

How Did the Principals Try to Enhance Teacher Morale?

Six of the nine schools in this study were located in New York where teachers were laid-off and transferred at astonishing rates in 1975 and 1976. Teacher turnover as a problem of securing support for the school has been addressed earlier; here we are concerned with the morale problem from which teachers who remained in the school suffered. Principals did not seem to give the problem a high priority for solving, despite the fact that teachers were in personal fear of being the next to be eliminated and became reluctant to engage in extensive planning or building for subsequent months. The data suggest that principals did little or nothing to act on this problem directly though they did acknowledge its existence.

The large context of teacher morale might be seen as the system of interpersonal relationships between teachers and the principal. The case of teacher lay-offs from the principal's perspective then becomes a major problematic situation or crisis, when teachers who are either personal friends or who are deemed essential to an educational program or project are the ones being lost. In only one of the schools did the principal, Harrison, work with parents to retain individual teachers. In all other cases in New York and also in River City when merger forced some transferring of teachers, principals accepted the wholesale loss of teachers but also rehired a small number of key individuals through discretionary funds.

However, such rehiring was often viewed as favoritism and did not engender any substantial improvement of morale among teachers. The only large scale case of improvement in morale may be seen in River City where the principals and community and teachers worked together to fight the closing of the school.

Visions Concerning Mediating Human Relations

River City - Washington School - Winter (6)

For Ned Winter the vision of a humanistic elementary school pertained particularly to the kinds of interpersonal relations among staff, students, principal and parents. Winter sought to create an environment of mutual trust, caring, and respect wherein open, honest communication processing could go on. In the following quotation from an interview, Winter expresses his belief in the value of such processing:

> ...Our workshops have been...90% interpersonal gut level talking about problems. Well, we found that when we went out and tried to have a task in a workshop that we pissed around there until it was time for a break. Then we'd have ourselves a few drinks and somebody would get into some heavy things and we'd come back for a session and...(spend) the whole night dealing with an interpersonal problem that had nothing to do with the task....You solve that interpersonal problem and task goes. You see, it's a personal problem that hangs up the task.

From this statement one would not be surprised to learn that Winter believed organizational problem solving to be personal problem solving.

Winter established a high level of trust in him by teachers, parents, and students. He personally counseled people on emotional, social, financial etc. problems. He mediated conflicts between people, particularly between students and teachers and between parents and teachers. His strategy was to bring conflicting parties together for an open dialogue of personal feelings. For cases of student misbehavior, it meant giving the child the respect of listening to his or her explanations. For conflicts between teachers and students, it sometimes meant Winter's helping the teacher to come to a deeper appreciation of the interpersonal relationships of the classroom. A lengthy illustration of this process follows, in Winter's words:

> A teacher and aide brought a child in that threw a temper tantrum and kicked and bit them and he tore them up pretty good and this was about the fourth time the teacher had dealt with it and so she couldn't deal with him any longer and at that time she had to go back to the classroom and so did the aide. And so I just set up an appointment for 45 minutes later they would come back down and deal with it again. In the meantime I had a chance to work with the boy and so the youngster got in touch with what he was supposed to do, so he felt like in his own image that he had worked the thing through. And when they came back down, he immediately apologized to both of them, told them he was wrong and that he just lost his temper and whatever. Well now, neither of those two were privileged to the process that had gone on for the last half an hour that I had been working with him, so the teacher was still very angry and very uptight...She said, "I'm having a hard time with that. You think all you can do is just apologize. I want to know what you are going to do next time?" And she started and she got about two or three minutes into it and I said, "what are you doing?" "Well, I just want him to understand..." and she started again just laying it out and instead of him feeling good about what he had done, he was feeling crestfallen because she hadn't accepted his apology. And I just turned to the youngster and said, "How do you feel about what she is saying," and he said, "I don't think she accepts my apology." "Oh, yes I do, I just want to know" and she started in on him again. I said, "You have a lot of anger toward..."
>
> "Yes, I'm very angry, this is the fourth time," and she started in again, she started laying it on him what all his past sins were (I said), "you are really the parent right now, aren't you?" And then she wheeled and then she started in on me and so we just had a real confrontation about that. And I said, "You have a right to be angry. I don't disagree with that. But I don't think you have a right to take it out on this young man here when he's trying. Ok, so he's done something four times before and he's made mistakes - but right now you are being the parent...punishing a child and saying and besides that last week you did this and this and you haven't forgotten that and there is still a lot of anger there." "Yes, I'm angry and I think he needs to know what is going to happen next time." And she....And we went on fifteen or twenty minutes in a confrontation, her and I. And the youngster just sat there listening to us. So finally the youngster

> left and she said, "I don't think that was fair. You don't have to deal with him every day and you jumped me in here right in front of him." I said, "you jumped him in front of me." And then she started crying and she said, "I hate that because that is the way my mother used to do me....Every time I made a mistake, she'd bring up my last sins for the last three years....I don't know why I did that" and then we started talking about her anger. So then the next day she and the youngster came back down and they sat there and we very calmly talked about the process that had gone on the day before (Interview 4/4/77).

Crises Concerning Mediating Human Relations

New York - East Town H.S. - Torzewski (9)

The massive teacher turnover in New York schools resulted in East Town High Schools losing half its staff on three occasions. The change in personnel left the school with two somewhat antagonistic camps of teachers, the veteran East Town teachers who volunteered for the school believing in its model and the teachers new to East Town but having taught for many years in traditional secondary schools. The latter group appeared to be rather unsympathetic to the predications of East Town and their feelings centered not only on the demands on them (e.g., student counseling periods but also on the very nature of the students. Torzewski felt they had a basic lack of respect for students. Perhaps because of these feelings in the newer teachers, for the first time in its history, East Town experienced in 1976 and 1977 student discipline problems of fights, hall loitering, and bad feelings between students and teachers.

While initiating staff development and training under the aegis of his assistant principal, Torzewski has also instituted a drastic tightening of discipline in the school building. For the first time in six years students needed passes for the halls and teachers patrolled the building.

Federal City - Wood J.H.S. - Clark (7)

As mentioned in earlier sections, Jim Clark had serious problems of morale and security when he came to Wood J.H.S. Assaults, rapes and vandalism were common. "Pot (in the bathrooms) and fighting were part of the curriculum" (DTA Seminar, New York 1977). Inattendance, truancy and cutting were rampant with an estimated 15% of the students in the halls instead of in their classes. Teachers frequently walked out of their classes and went home.

To deal with immediate problems of excesses in student misbehavior and of building security, Clark tightened regulations. He locked all doors to the building except the front, checked students coming in, and made assistant principals actively patrol halls. He established a policy of suspending students on one violation.

Perhaps most important in the long run was his creating a positive image for Wood J.H.S. To accomplish this he enlisted support of parents and community leaders, as mentioned earlier. But within the school, he encouraged staff cohesion through exhortation and staff development established dialogues with students. He met with student leaders and small groups as well as two or three classes at a time to explain procedures and to exhort them to cooperate and build a strong, positive school.

Problematic Situations Concerning Mediating Human Relations

New York - Responsive Education - Chavez & Harrison (8)

Both of these principals desired to create small supportive corridor communities for students. In fact some students' misbehavior in schools (e.g., wandering) is not misbehavior in open education programs which foster movement. Principals found personalized and informal ways of handling students' discipline. Also principals tended to discuss with teachers that the problem of misbehavior existed not in the child but perhaps in the environment of the school (e.g., is the work challenging enough?).

In the area of teacher morale, Ted Harrison supported the parents of School B when they refused to accept newly transferred teachers, demanding retention of their competent open education teachers who were well known to them. While there is not clear data on the effect of this successful protest on teacher morale, Karunakaran (1977) suggests in her case study that these actions have strong implications for the retention of teachers based on merit and competence rather than on seniority alone.

New York - Southend I.S. - Plotnikov (2)

From the little data available in this problem area one can see that Plotnikov had close personal relations with many staff members particularly the key teachers who had been with him in the old school and in the first mini-school at Southend I.S. He expressed interest in their personal and professional lives, knowing their families. He notified them of certification exams and opportunities for professional development. During the massive teacher turnovers, Plotnikov retained some teachers he wanted through appointments at his discretion, and he also tried to get some leaving teachers placed in other schools in the district.

Federal City - Stanton J.H.S. - Gross (7)

In the section of this paper on the problems of administering the school, the relationship which Gross had with his staff was described. The Stanton Family of thirty had a game which allowed both formal and informal interaction to exist. Knowing the rules and playing the game, Gross and staff performed their functions together.

New York - Polk and Madison High Schools - Lewis & Brinski (1)

The two large high schools had definite problems in the same areas as did Wood J.H.S. but not to the same degree. Principals cited discipline, security, halls, inattendance, lateness, and cutting as problems. Brinski added her concern for students' anxiety, frustration, and violent alienation. In addition to student problems these schools encountered the massive teacher turnovers in New York, although it was not as severe in Polk H.S., according to Lewis, because of a more experienced teaching staff with much seniority.

Both principals recognized the need for tight security in the building. Brinski adopted extensive recommendations from her assistant principals to enact and enforce strict limits on student time and movement. She also patrolled halls herself upon occasion. At Polk as least one uniformed policeman is on duty daily.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

While the major findings have been discussed in the paper, their significance and implications will be mentioned here. The five capacities operating in the five problem areas suggest problem solving methods which seem most related to the role of the principal. Some of these techniques or methods used with increasing success by principals in this study may be taught to other principals by technical assisters to build capacities for problem solving. For example, principals could be trained in strategies of obtaining outside funding and analyzing administrative tasks to enhance the educational programs and to delegate authority and responsibility wisely to others.

For other methods of problem solving which have definite value premises, technical assisters ought to exercise some caution in developing a capacity for problem solving. Technical assisters must be sensitive to the marked differences in what principals consider problem solving methods appropriate to their values, school situation, and role. Examples of such methods might be the political and legal actions taken against the school district and the sharing of decision making with parents. Somewhat related methods which necessitate a principal and technical assister determining the most appropriate set of strategies would be, for example, using formal and/or informal structures to involve divergent groups in decision making and using behavior which balances or which integrates these groups.

This paper does not illustrate how one determines appropriate strategies for solving problems or for building a capacity for problem solving. It does not illuminate how a principal decides on the optimal timing of certain methods. Also, it does not show how the TAGs in these sites facilitated the building of these capacities. A subsequent paper is planned which will addresss these important and relevant issues.

The distinction between problem types, visions, crises, and problematic situations ought to have an applicability to groups in the school other than the principal or administrators. This suggests that further analysis could be performed on the DTA data which might address the perceptions of these other groups, paying particular attention to the visions of these groups.

If visions are powerful mechanisms for assessing the current state as well as motivating and guiding decisions for action of principals, they may also hold that power for other groups. This suggests that technical assisters ought to not only be concerned with imparting techniques of solving problems but also with developing visions. In fact, at least one of the TAG groups in this study, Marian Barber's Responsive Education project does such development. At the very least, the finding suggests the technical assisters must be sensitive to the visions and values of the school people as well as aware of, and perhaps even candidly open about, their own visions and values.

Several questions arise from these suggestions. Is technical assistance purely technical in nature or is it always rooted in a philosophical and axiological base? If mutual adaptation between assister and school people ought to occur, on what levels must they share perceptions, values, visions, etc.? These must be left for further investigation.

Finally, the findings of this examination of the capacities for problem solving related to the problem perceptions of principals have implications for the capacity for organizational problem solving in general. Two basic modes might be sketched which seem to portray two different types of schools. The first school with a capacity for problem solving might be better characterized as a school community, predicated on a vision of parent and community involvement in the daily activities and governance of the school. School people actively seek additional resources for the school. Decision making and policy setting is accomplished through a variety of structures, formal and informal which involve parents, teachers, and community members. A school leader works to help these groups collaborate. There is a definite philosophy of teaching and curriculum which guides development and practice in the school, including relations between teachers and students and the administrative arrangements. In the leader's collaboration with the groups, optimal use is made of people's talents for the entire school's operation.

The second mode emphasizes the practical rationale of developing optimal working relationships with the school district. Additional resources would be actively sought for the school. Decision making would be shared within the professional staff of the school through various structures, formal and informal, with a school leader fostering collaboration among groups. Curricculum and teaching might be predicated on either a philosophical or practical rationale which would guide administrative practice and student behavior.

There are differences between these two schools. One has substantial input from the parent and community and is predicated upon a vision of their involvement; the other is a school operating mainly, in loco parentis. A second difference is between the rationales, the first holds a primarily philosophical basis for operations, the second has a practical basis. Perhaps the concept of vision can provide a link between these two bases. If a vision is philosophically based, the philosophy must be well-developed both theoretically and practically in order to guide action and problem solving in the school. If a vision is based on a practical rationale which has been developed through extensive experience, this lore provides a basis for the problem solving. Thus, problem solving deductively developed from a philosophy and problem solving inductively developed from experience may converge. Perhaps, in the most successful technical assistance groups both processes, deductive and inductive, have been used to develop their visions for what schools ought to be.

REFERENCES

Baehr, Melany E.
1975 A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship. Chicago: Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago.

Becker, Gerald, Richard Withycombe, Frank Doyel, Edgar Miller, Claude
1971 Morgan, Lou De Loretto, Bill Aldrige, and Keith Goldhammer Elementary School Prinicpals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brillance and Potholes of Pestilence. Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Univsity of Oregon.

Becker, Howard S., et al.
1961 Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Brown, Robert
1977 Case Study of the Imaginative Educational Cooperation Project. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Cross, Ray and Vernon Burnett
1969 "Problem situations encountered by school principals in different socio-economic settings." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, February.

Davis, Jacqueline Peek
1977 Case Study of the School Self-Improvement Project. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Doll, Russell C.
1969 "Variations among inner city elementary schools: An investigation into the nature and causes of their differences." Kansas City, MO: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, University of Missouri.

Dollar, Bruce
1977 "Toward a problem solving repertoire for community accessibility to schools." Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Dreeben, Robert
1967 "The contribution of schooling to the learning of norms." Harvard Educational Review 37:211-37.

Dreeben, Robert and Neal C. Gross
1965 The Role Behavior of School Principals. Cambridge MA: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Gittell, Marilyn
1965 Local Control of Education. New York: Praeger.

1977 "Critique of the citizens participation movement in education." Journal of Education 159: 7-22.

Harrison, Ted (pseudonym)
(n.d.) "Decentralization five years later: A principal's view." Urban Review (dates and name withheld to protect anonymity).

Holliday, Frances
1977 Building on Cultural Strengths: The Experience of the Chicago Region in Building Capacity in Educational Problem Solving in Local Urban Schools. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

House, Ernest
1974 The Politics of Educational Innovation. Berkeley: McCutcheon.

Karunakaran, Chitra
1977 Case Study of the Responsive Education Project. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Lenoir, Teresa C.
1977 Toward a Theory of the Facilitation of a Sustained Capacity for Problem Solving. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Mascaro, Francis G.
1976 "Early on-the-job socialization of first-year elementary school principals." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association, April.

McClearly, Lloyd E.
1971 "An essay on role attrition: Three studies of the job of the principal." Unpublished paper. Salt Lake City: University of Utah.

McPherson, R. Bruce and Columbus Salley
1975 "Getting off the hook: More reasonable expectations for principals." Manuscript. Chicago: Consortium for Educational Leadership.

McPherson, R. Bruce, Columbus Salley, and Melany Baehr
"What principals do: Preliminary implications of 'A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship.' " Consortium Currents 2:1-10.

Miles, Matthew
1976 "Capacity for problem solving." DTA Project Internal Memorandum to T. Lenoir, November 21, 1976.

Paoli, Lilliam
1977 Case Study of Neighborhood Corporation for Educational Improvement Project. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Rivera, Gladys and Patrick Montesano
1977 Case Study of Southend Intermediate School and Inner City Consortium. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Sieber, Sam
1976 "Structure versus function in models of educational change: A dissenting opinion." Unpublished paper.

Schmuck, Richard
1977 Toward a Theory of Facilitating Organizational Problem Solving in Urban Schools, Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Vidich, Arthur T. and Charles McReynolds
1969 "High school principals study seminar. Final report." New York: New School for Social Research.

1971 "Rhetoric versus reality: A study of New York City high school principals," in M. Wax, et al. (eds.) Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books.

Wilson, Stephen
1977 Explorations of the Concept of Local Capacity for Problem Solving: An Introduction to a Series of Papers Analyzing Nine School Improvement Projects. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

Winter, Ned and Lee Dole (pseudonyms)
(n.d.) "A neighborhood school board: its infancy, its crises, its growth." Education (dates and names withheld to protect anonymity).

Winter, Ned, et al. (pseudonym)
(n.d.) "A humanistic program for change in a large urban school system." Journal of Humanistic Psychology (dates and name withheld to protect anonymity).